


Mary H. Colburn
1918



~~50~~
C



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2023 with funding from
Kahle/Austin Foundation

Americanism *and* Social Democracy

BY
JOHN SPARGO

Author of

"SOCIAL DEMOCRACY EXPLAINED" "THE BITTER
CRY OF THE CHILDREN" ETC.



HARPER & BROTHERS PUBLISHERS
NEW YORK AND LONDON

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

Copyright, 1918, by Harper & Brothers
Printed in the United States of America
Published May, 1918

D-S

TO MY BEST FRIEND
MY WIFE

CONTENTS

CHAP.		PAGE
	PREFACE	vii
I.	AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY . . .	3
II.	NATIONALISM: THE NEW SOCIAL DEMOCRACY .	39
III.	SOCIALISM AND INTERNATIONALISM	101
IV.	INTERNATIONAL SOCIALISM AND THE WAR . .	141
V.	THE GERMAN DOMINATION OF AMERICAN SO- CIALISM AND ITS CONSEQUENCES . . .	159
VI.	INFLUENCE OF THE WORLD WAR UPON SO- CIALIST THEORY AND TACTICS	189
VII.	DEMOCRACY APPLIED TO FOREIGN POLICIES AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS	215
VIII.	WHAT A REFERENDUM ON WAR WOULD MEAN	243

APPENDIX

CHAPTERS IN SOCIALIST CONTROVERSY

CHAP.		PAGE
I.	THE FIGHT IN THE PARTY EXECUTIVE . . .	257
II.	THE NATIONAL CONVENTION OF THE PARTY ACTS	271
III.	THE "MAJORITY REPORT"—A CRITICISM . .	298
IV.	A LETTER OF RESIGNATION	315

PREFACE

THE following pages aim to present Social Democracy—that is, democratic Socialism, as a movement in full harmony with the generous ideals of democracy and internationalism which the word “Americanism” signifies, and to which President Wilson has given such eloquent expression in the remarkable series of war addresses with which he has enriched the literature of democracy.

There is no chauvinism in the claim that the ideals of true democratic Socialism are identical with Americanism; that a fine internationalism is implicit in our history, our traditions, and our political institutions. This nation was born of a passionate aspiration for democratic freedom. It has been guided by that aspiration in its dealings with other nations. We have not yet attained a perfect democracy, but we are making speedy progress in the direction of that goal. Loyalty to America is consistent with the ut-

PREFACE

most devotion to internationalism; disloyalty to America is disloyalty to every conception of internationalism worthy the name.

Some of the chapters of the book have been published independently, as separate articles, in various magazines and papers, as contributions to the warfare upon the reactionary and stupid policy adopted by the Socialist Party of America—a policy which has identified Socialism with sentimental peace-at-any-price pacifism and shameful surrender to tyranny. Most of the chapters appear here for the first time. The book represents, I believe, the views of many thousands of American Social Democrats.

I have sketched the outlines of a constructive program upon which all Social Democrats can unite. I believe that most of the men and women of the Social Democratic League, as well as many thousands of Socialist Party members who do not accept that party's officially declared war policy, will accept the program thus sketched. Doubtless many will question that part which deals with the liquor question, which goes beyond the position taken by many Social Democrats. Needless to say, I believe the prohibition policy outlined to be

PREFACE

entirely sound and a necessary deduction from Socialist principles.

At the suggestion of many friends I have included in the volume a documentary survey of the controversy upon the question of war policy which created such a sorry division in the ranks of American Socialists. It seems to me well that such a summary of the controversy, with the full text of the most important documents, should be available to the student and to the general reader. For my own share in that controversy I have no apologies to offer and the several documents must speak for themselves. I am quite content to abide by the judgment of the American public and by the judgment of my Socialist friends when the passions of the times have subsided.

My thanks are due to the editors of the *Atlantic Monthly*, *Harper's Magazine*, the *Metropolitan Magazine*, and the *Public Ledger*, of Philadelphia, for permission to reprint chapters which originally appeared in their pages.

NEW YORK CITY,
February 14, 1918.

I

AMERICANISM AND
SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

I

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

I

IT is a remarkable fact that in practically every country Socialism has been denounced as a "foreign importation," as a movement alien to the spirit and interests of the country, imported by foreign agitators. When the Social Democratic Federation began its campaign in England in the eighteen eighties, Mr. Gladstone declared that democratic Socialism could not survive in England, because it was of German origin. Bismarck, on the other hand, was equally certain that Socialism could not prosper in

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

Germany because it was a foreign movement, an importation from England.

Unfortunately, there are still a great many Americans who insist upon repeating the mistake of Gladstone and Bismarck and who regard Socialism as an alien thing; "a movement of Jews and foreigners," as one of our lawmakers recently remarked. Of course, it is a fact that Socialism has no nationality. It appears in every country as an indigenous product of its social conditions. Where there is coexistent wealth and poverty there the resentment of the oppressed and exploited invariably appears and assumes the forms of a Socialist movement. Thus, with the development of the capitalist system in Japan, the Japanese Socialist movement made its appearance, and that is the story of every civilized country. Surely it is essential to our national well-being that we understand these very elemental facts.

There is, indeed, no historical justification for the belief that Socialism is un-American. As a matter of fact, the roots of Socialism strike very deeply into the soil of our national life and history. It was in this country, for instance, on the banks of the Wabash, that Robert Owen made his most important attempt to realize his Socialist

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

utopia. His New Harmony was in many respects the most splendid of all the attempts to found Socialist commonwealths without regard to the laws of historical development. Owen's propaganda made a profound appeal to the best elements in American life in the second quarter of the nineteenth century. Men like William Maclure, the famous geologist, the principal founder of the Philadelphia Academy of Natural Science; Thomas Say, the famous zoölogist; Charles Alexander Lesneur, and others equally eminent in the intellectual world, joined with Owen in his heroic undertaking. Frances Wright, the splendid pioneer of the feminist movement, was associated with Owen and inspired by him. Owen's son, Robert Dale Owen, who wrote the Act of Congress under which the Smithsonian Institution of Washington was established, one of the noblest figures in American political history, was essentially a product of the New Harmony. It was he who, on the 17th of September, 1862, wrote the remarkable letter to President Lincoln which influenced him more than anything else, more, indeed, than all other things combined, according to Salmon P. Chase, to issue the Emancipation Proclamation. Lincoln himself, in his boyhood, was inspired

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

by the splendid vision of New Harmony, which at that time seemed destined to be one of the world's most wonderful centers of learning.

Even the great Lafayette seems to have come within the sphere of the influence of the New Harmony movement, at all events his name is included among the trustees to whom Frances Wright deeded the land, the slaves, and the principal property of the Nashoba Community, that noble attempt to raise the negro slaves of the South to intellectual, social, and economic equality with the "whites."

It was in America, too, that the most brilliant and daring attempts to carry out the social theories of Charles Fourier were made. Albert Brisbane, the gifted father of the well-known editor of the Hearst newspapers; Horace Greeley, of the *New York Tribune*; Parke Godwin, of the *Evening Post*; Charles A. Dana; George Ripley, the famous Unitarian; Margaret Fuller; William Henry Channing; James Russell Lowell; Thomas Wentworth Higginson; Francis G. Shaw; Nathaniel Hawthorne; Ralph Waldo Emerson; William Ellery Channing, and Henry D. Thoreau—these are only a few of the great American names associated with

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

the Fourierist movement of the United States.

It was in America, too, that Etienne Cabet attempted to realize the Socialist ideals set forth in his *Voyage to Icaria*. In 1848 Cabet's followers undertook to build their utopia in Texas. Like Owen and Fourier, Cabet saw in America a more fruitful and promising soil than he could find anywhere else in the world. That his utopian ideals appealed to fewer men and women of intellectual eminence than those of Owen and Fourier must not obscure for us the fact that he had a large American following.

If we seek the explanation of the cause which led these daring social innovators, prophets of a new society, to choose America as the theater of their most earnest experiments, we shall find, I think, that they were drawn to this country by the powerful magnet of what I may well describe as the essential qualities of Americanism. America offered, first of all, a degree of political democracy and freedom which did not exist anywhere else in the world. There was that diffused equality of political opportunity which necessarily played so large a part in all the great Socialist utopias. Then, too, thanks in part to the political conditions

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

described, and in part to the abundance of cheap land, there was a greater degree of equality of economic opportunity in America than existed in any of the European nations.

For the moment we are not dealing with moral forces, but with political and economic factors which have played a great part in our national development. Surely it is not too much to assert that these two great fundamental facts, political equality and equality of economic opportunity, constitute the very essence of that which we so properly call "Americanism." It is a fact that from the foundation of the Republic we have occupied a place in the vanguard of the great human struggle toward democracy in government and in economic opportunity. It was the affinity of their social ideals with the conscious aim of our national life which drew the great utopian Socialists to this country, and it was that same affinity which drew so many of the noblest and best men and women of this country to the ranks of the Socialist pioneers.

In that early period during which the Owenite and Fourierist movements developed in this country there appeared the beginnings of a native American Socialist literature of very great promise. Thomas

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

Skidmore's *The Right of Man to Property*, which appeared in 1829, was a remarkable presentation of Socialist thoughts in almost Marxian terms. There was an earlier work by a writer named Byllesby, *Sources and Effects of Unequal Wealth*, which was likewise a keen and brilliant analysis of economic exploitation. These and similar works of the period gave a great stimulus to the labor movement of the time.

When the "Free Soil" movement appeared, a large number of the German immigrants who had been forced from their "fatherland" by the harsh political and economic conditions prevailing, and the persecution which followed the revolutionary outbreaks in Germany, identified themselves with that movement and to a very considerable degree dominated it, so that one finds that from that time onward until the middle of the eighteen-eighties the Socialist thought and effort of the country were essentially German. The rise of a native American Socialism at that time is one of the notable facts of our social history. Henry George, the celebrated founder of the Single Tax philosophy, may not be properly classified as a Socialist, though the taxation of land values for the social benefit is essentially

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

a Socialist measure. Nevertheless, by his unceasing propaganda, George inspired a vast amount of Socialist aspiration and effort alike in this country and in England. Just as in the latter country one can trace the rise of the modern political Socialist movement to the George propaganda, so in this country it is easy to see that the same influence gave rise to a great native Socialist movement.

Then there was Edward Bellamy, whose famous propagandist tract in the guise of a novel, *Looking Backward*, appeared in 1887. As a result of the influence of this work, the Nationalist movement arose. Nationalist clubs appeared in all parts of the country, and it was evident that American Socialism had found its own interpreter. From many points of view it was unfortunate that this native movement, like those before it, should be captured by German dogmatists, alien in their thinking from the American people, and largely incapable of understanding American institutions and traditions.

II

The foregoing brief sketch will serve to show to what extent Socialism has become

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

interwoven in the fabric of our national life and history. We are a nation of individualists, and, paradoxically, therefore, sympathetic with the social democratic ideal, for democratic Socialism is essentially an attempt to realize a larger individualism, differing in this respect from many communistic and paternalistic schemes. Democratic Socialism is not hostile to private property or private industrial enterprises. It is wholly compatible with a wide diffusion of private property, and with the fullest individual liberty and initiative in industrial enterprise. It does not seek to establish communism in consumption of goods, but only communism in economic opportunity. It would permit the individual to have and own all the property that the individual can use to advantage without imposing a disadvantage on other individuals. It would recognize this division which runs through the economic life in all important industrial organizations, and maintain the private ownership and individual direction of all those tools, processes, and functions which are individualistic in their nature, applying public ownership and democratic direction only to those things which are essentially collectivistic in their nature. Thus, it would permit private

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

ownership of the automobile, but insist upon public ownership of the railway system. It would provide for private ownership and personal direction of the small workshop of the individual producer, while applying public ownership and democratic management to the great modern industrial establishments.

The whole task of democratic Socialism is to achieve an equality of economic opportunity analogous to the equality of political opportunity which characterizes our government. It would make the economic life of the nation as responsive to the people's will as the political life of the nation is.¹ As a result of the industrial development of the past century, aided by the special privileges conferred by class legislation, a small minority of citizens have come to control the great bulk of the capital and industrial resources of the nation. The great natural monopolies—land, minerals, water-power, oil-wells, coal-mines, and so on—are owned and controlled by this minority and exploited by them, and are available to the mass of the workers only upon the sufferance of the privileged owning class. Until this condi-

¹ The exclusion of women from the franchise is, of course, a notable and regrettable exception to this.

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

tion is destroyed, society must be divided into economic classes with conflicting interests, there must be coexistent wealth and poverty, and equality of economic opportunity must be little better than a dream.

If we substitute for private ownership and individual exploitation in this domain public ownership and democratic management of the common interests, it will be possible for essential private property to flourish, and for every citizen to have and own all the things that a citizen can use to advantage without imposing a disadvantage upon any other citizen. Of course, this involves a vital and rigorous interference with the institution of private property.

This, however, is not nearly so difficult a matter in America as it would be in older countries where economic class lines are more rigid and more permanently fixed. Within the memory of men now living we have removed, by a violent process, from the category of private ownership an important commodity, human life. The abolition of slavery was a fundamental readjustment of the relation between men and things, between life and property, as important in many ways as the readjustment in economic relations contemplated by Social Democracy.

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

It is fortunate for us that our class lines are not so rigidly established as those of older nations. Property relations are not possessed of that peculiar sanctity which attaches to them in older civilizations. There is, therefore, every probability that the transformation of our economic system from capitalism to industrial democracy can be successfully accomplished without recourse to violence.

The socialization of our economic life in this country will have little or no relation to formal systems of social philosophy or economic science. We shall emancipate ourselves from the evils of land monopoly, not because we accept a particular economic theory, but because we realize that an efficient adjustment of our economic needs to our economic opportunities requires that the land values created by the presence of population and by collective expenditures be possessed and used by the community which creates them. In like manner the public ownership of coal and metal mines, water-power, natural gas and oil wells, steam and electric railroads, telegraph and telephone systems, waterworks, light and power plants, terminal warehouses and elevators, and all those public utilities and economic functions

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

which depend on franchises or are conducted on a large-scale, non-competitive basis, will be developed in response to our actual experiences. The whole trend of modern industrial development is in this direction. It is not very likely that state and national governments will wholly supplant the individual proprietor, but it is evident that we are rapidly moving in the direction of an extensive system of collectivism, in which industry will be conducted not for the profit of individuals, but for the common advantage.

This democratic Socialist ideal is not to be attained by some revolution, but by the methods of evolution. As a counterpart to the political democracy which we are perfecting, there must be developed a corresponding industrial democracy. The progressive elimination of the control of the industrial resources and functions of the nation from the hands of the privileged class must be accomplished if we are to maintain popular sovereignty in our political life. More and more our political government has to concern itself with the economic basis of life. Unless we are to abandon the effort to realize the democratic ideal and throw away the degree of democracy already attained, we must work toward a scientific reorganiza-

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

tion of the industrial life of the nation on the basis of the social ownership of the fundamental natural resources and the major industrial functions, and the equitable participation by all in the work and in the fruits of industry. Income from any source without the rendering of services by those physically and mentally able to render such service must be made impossible.

This doctrine is not opposed to the fundamental ideals of America. It is, on the contrary, a logical development from those ideals. Equality of opportunity in government and industry is a fundamental requisite of Americanism. In the stress of war-times we have discovered what indeed the Socialists have already told us, that capitalism is inherently inefficient. Nowhere has it been found possible to secure a maximum of efficiency in the transportation system, for example, so long as it was in private hands. Nothing less than public ownership and operation will make possible the realization of the utmost utility from the great agencies of transportation and communication. It is becoming evident, too, that any further great development of our productive system must require a production of electrical power at the lowest possible rate and its greatest

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

diffusion among the people. At every point private ownership interferes with the realization of this ideal. Science has already placed within our grasp possibilities of an almost infinite enlargement of our productive power, but we fail to use them because of the interference of private interests with the larger interests of society.

We have seen the safety of the nation imperiled by the operation of the private ownership and exploitation of the coal-supply of the nation. This danger was dramatically revealed to us in a great national crisis. But we do not fully realize as yet that in all other departments of our industrial organization, at all times, the same fearful antagonism of private interests to the social welfare is present.

There is no more justification for private or quasi-private ownership of railways, mines, power-plants, telegraph systems, markets, grain-elevators, or steel-factories than there would be for the public ownership of tooth-brushes or bonnets. This is the Socialism that is developing out of the soil of American political and economic conditions. It is the logical outcome of the Declaration of Independence, and of the institutions of popular sovereignty which we have erected

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY
on the basis of the ideals set forth in that
immortal document.

III

It does not matter very much whether this end is attained through the medium of a particular political party. Nor does it matter in the slightest whether the Socialist label is applied to it. Little groups of sectaries, more or less fanatical cults, may concern themselves with these matters, but the great mass of the American people will remain indifferent to them. If we may judge by past experiences, there is little likelihood that the parties which bear the name "Socialist" will carry this program into effect.

Forty-one years have elapsed since the Socialist Labor Party, of which the Socialist Party of the United States is a development, was formed. Seventeen years have elapsed since the organization of the latter body. It cannot be seriously claimed, I think, that from a political point of view either party has been brilliantly successful. As propagandist agencies they have performed a great work; a very large part of the conscious Socialist sentiment in this country can be

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

attributed to the ceaseless and devoted labors of the men and women belonging to these two organizations. Politically, however, they have absolutely failed. In no country in the world has the Socialist movement had to record such a melancholy history of political ineptitude and failure. Socialism was never as strong in this country as to-day in the sense that there never were so many people who believed in the ideas and ideals of Socialism. But politically the movement has little, if any, advanced beyond the condition of thirty-five years ago. A whole generation of futility and failure lies behind, and there is no discernible promise in the Socialist Party of a more successful future.

The Socialist Party of America and the pitiful remnant of the Socialist Labor Party are equally un-American in the sense that their methods are not in accord with American ends, American conditions, and American political psychology. It stands to reason that if there is ever to be a successful Socialist political party, it cannot afford to ignore the political customs, traditions, and psychology of the nation. It is axiomatic that any attempt to build up a successful political party while ignoring these must fail. It

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

would be enlightening if we could have a careful survey of the history of the Socialist movement in this country in the several states dating from the foundation of the Socialist Labor Party. The result of such a survey would be to show, I think, that the political methods of American Socialism have been pathetically ineffective and that the Socialist parties have on the whole retarded the political progress of Socialism. In a general way every Socialist who has taken an active part in the movement knows the main features which such a survey must reveal.

If we take a map of any state north of the Mason-Dixon line—excluding the South on account of the abnormal conditions existing there—and try to represent upon it graphically the present position of the Socialist Party, we shall obtain some astonishing results. It does not really matter very much which state we select. The results will be about the same in New York and California, in Massachusetts and Montana. If we stick a red-capped pin to mark each town in which there is a Socialist local that is even nominally alive, and a black-capped pin to mark the towns in which there are no such local organizations, almost without excep-

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

tion the black markers will greatly outnumber the red ones. This, of course, establishes an important point in our survey—namely, that as yet the party has not succeeded in establishing locals in nearly all of the towns. In a majority of the towns it has as yet no footing.

A simple test will show that this condition is not due to lack of enterprise; to failure to try to organize in the towns in which no locals now exist. If we go over the map again and stick green-capped pins to mark the towns in which Socialist locals have existed at some time, we shall find that nearly every town that is marked with a black marker to indicate that it has no local is marked also with a green one to indicate that it has had a Socialist local at some time. If we go farther and place an extra green marker to mark each separate organization and reorganization of the party in each town, we shall find that in most of the towns local organizations have been started several times. They have lasted awhile, disbanded, been revived again, only to last a little while. In many of the states there is hardly a town now without a Socialist local which has not had a number of such locals at different times in its history.

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

The experience of the town of Rutland, Vermont, with which I am familiar, is quite typical. It has no Socialist local at this time, notwithstanding the repeated organizations which have been effected during forty years. Early in its history the Socialist Labor Party established a flourishing local in Rutland. From 1877 to 1900 there were not less than seven different starts. Sometimes the membership reached a respectable figure and a considerable vote was cast. I do not know how many times locals have been organized in that city since the formation of the Socialist Party in 1901. I do know that within the past decade locals have been started on four separate occasions. To-day there is no local organization and the Socialist vote is a negligible quantity. Returning to our map, then, we find that for some reason Socialist locals apparently do not thrive with anything like a promising robustness in the soil of our American political life.

Let us now take some yellow-capped markers to indicate the towns in which a more or less dependable Socialist vote is cast. Generally speaking, we shall find that the towns and cities which have no local organizations, but in which such local or-

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

ganizations have existed at various times, contribute to the Socialist vote. This fact shows that there are Socialists in these towns who have not been altogether discouraged by their failure to maintain Socialist locals. Now, if we take blue-capped markers to mark the places in which the Socialist vote is lower than it was ten, fifteen, or twenty years ago, we shall find that, proportionately to the number of towns in each group, there are as many blue pins in the places marked with red pins, indicating the existence of local organizations, as in the towns marked with black pins, indicating the absence of such organizations. In other words, the fact that the Socialist local survives the vicissitudes of years does not insure a great Socialist vote. After the election of 1916, with its sensational decline in the Socialist vote, the State Secretary of California called attention to the fact that, generally speaking, the decline in the Socialist vote in the state was most marked where active local organizations existed, the increase being in districts where there were no local organizations.

Finally, if we use small American flags to mark the towns and cities in which at any time Socialists have been elected to office, we shall find a surprisingly large num-

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

ber of towns and cities so marked. The average American has no idea of the number and variety of Socialist officials elected in this country during the past twenty years. We shall find, however, that our flags are very generally placed alongside of black pins, indicating the absence of a local Socialist organization at this time. If we bring this record up to date by substituting for the American flags little white flags to mark the places where Socialists, after having once elected representatives, have lost them or have fewer than formerly, we shall find that white flags have taken the places of nearly all of the American flags. In other words, there are only a few places in which the Socialists have been able to hold what they once gained. When they have managed to elect representatives, the electorate has not, in many cases, been convinced that their re-election was important or desirable.

We are now in a position to summarize the principal facts revealed by our survey. They are as follows:

1. The Socialist Party has no local organization in most of the cities and towns of most of the states.
2. Where no local organization exists that fact is not due to want of effort to organize

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

them. In practically all cases locals have been organized (in many cases several times), but have failed to survive.

3. The local which exists in many instances is the latest of a series of efforts to maintain the local organization.

4. Socialist faith and conviction persist in spite of the failure of the Socialist local to survive or attain efficient development.

5. The Socialist vote is lower in many of the principal industrial centers of the country than it was ten, fifteen, or twenty years ago, and the decline is just as marked in the places where Socialist locals have survived as in other places.

6. In most cases the Socialist Party, having succeeded in electing its representatives to legislative and executive offices, has failed to hold the confidence of the electorate.

Surely these facts constitute prima-facie evidence of failure. If a farmer plants crop after crop of a certain kind and finds that it utterly fails to grow, except in a few spots, and in these spots barely manages to live, without healthy development and ripening, the natural conclusion for him to reach is either that the crop is not suited to his soil or climatic conditions or that the methods of cultivation are wrong.

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

The parable needs no elucidation. Either Socialism is unsuited to America, incapable of being developed in our political life, or the methods of the Socialist Party have been wrong. Since it is impossible for me to accept the first of these conclusions. I must perforce accept the second.

Disagreeable as the recognition of such facts may be, the candid Socialist will desire to face them and to understand their significance. There can be no ignoring the fact that thus far the Socialist Party has failed to accomplish its purpose. One striking evidence of this failure not yet mentioned is the fact that, notwithstanding the party claim that it is the representative of the best thought and vision of the working-class, the best and most efficient elements of our working-class, its natural leaders are not even in the ranks of the Socialist Party. There are, of course, exceptions to this generalization. There are cities in which the Socialist Party membership embraces most of the natural leaders of the proletariat, but in the vast majority of cases this is not the condition. The party does not include the best and most valuable members of the working-class, those who possess those mental and moral qualities which confer superi-

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

ority and without which the party cannot hope to win.

In a general way it is safe to say that individual superiority and efficiency in the working-class, as in any social group, are manifested by leadership explicitly or implicitly acknowledged, by selection for service, and by popular esteem concretely expressed. This means that superiority and efficiency in the working-class are generally manifested in the following ways: (a) the holding of positions of authority, trust, and power in labor unions, fraternal orders, and similar organizations; (b) eminence in one's trade or occupation, including a reputation for efficiency as a worker, influence among fellow-workers, popular selection as spokesman for the shop or factory group, and so on; (c) general reputation in the community for intelligence and character; (d) prominence in movements for civic, spiritual, and moral advancement. It used to be the boast of American Socialists that the party was composed of the *élite* of the working-class. What was meant was that most of those who by the above mental or moral standards were judged superior to their fellows belonged to the party. It was not altogether an empty and unjustified boast. The party

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

membership was small and it contained a far larger proportion than it now does of working-men whose outstanding ability and worth were acknowledged by their fellows. Whatever the reason may be, the younger men rising into prominence in the trade-union movement, for example, are not identifying themselves with the Socialist Party. In all parts of the country there are young men and women coming to the front in the labor movement, but somehow the Socialist Party does not attract them. They are indifferent to it or are unconvinced either of its soundness or of its competence.

I have traveled pretty extensively in the United States in recent years, lecturing on Socialism, and have come into very close contact with the party workers in hundreds of cities and towns. Many times I have obtained lists of the active and capable men in the local labor unions, and inquired concerning their attitude toward the Socialist movement. In a surprisingly large number of cases I have been informed that nearly all of them were formerly Socialist Party members, but that they were no longer identified with the movement. It appears that at one time or other the party, in hundreds of places, has enlisted most of the natural

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

leaders of the working-class of America, but has failed to hold them. Somehow it holds best the least capable and efficient part of the proletariat; the capable and efficient it does not hold.

Years ago, while a member of the National Executive Committee of the Socialist Party, I told my colleagues that I had reached the conclusion that the party machinery was admirably devised for eliminating the best and most efficient part of the working-class and the best and most efficient part of the middle class from the party, and for confining the party to the least capable and efficient parts of these two classes.

This is, of course, a terrific indictment, if true, as I believe it to be. It becomes a very serious matter for all who have the interests of democratic Socialism at heart, and places upon them the responsibility for creating some new instrument for the achievement of Socialist needs in this country. The Socialist Party is fundamentally un-American. In the first place, it seeks to impose a rigid discipline upon its membership which is utterly alien and repugnant to the American spirit. Naturally, whenever a serious attempt has been made to enforce this discipline the attempt has failed and accom-

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

plished nothing save the disruption of the movement. The spirit back of the party organization is of mid-European origin, and wholly incompatible with the free spirit of American democracy. The fact that a party member whose Socialist convictions are intense reaches the conclusions that he cannot with self-respect vote for a particular Socialist candidate, that while voting for the party ticket in general he is compelled by a sense of honor or of social duty to vote for a non-Socialist candidate for a particular office, brings him under the party ban and subjects him to expulsion. No matter how unfit a particular candidate may be for the office, nor how great a catastrophe his election to that office might be, the Socialist Party insists that failure to vote for him is treachery to the Socialist cause. Of course, it is nothing of the kind, and nobody believes that it will ever be possible to convince the American people that it is.

The Socialist Party has attempted, consciously or otherwise, to impose upon the political life of America a system of machine politics compared with which a Tammany system is extremely democratic. A party rule provides that on accepting nomination

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

for public office every party candidate must write and sign his resignation from that office and place it, undated, in the hands of the local committee. If at any time during his term of office, should he be elected, he declines to carry out the instructions of the party local, no matter how small the local may be, the resignation may be dated by the organization, and by it sent to the proper authorities. Of course, this would have no legal weight, and it would be perfectly easy for the official to notify the authorities that he had not authorized its presentation or that he had decided to withdraw it, but the moral obligation remains. In a number of instances the elected representatives of the party have refused to sign such resignations, or have repudiated them when they were presented. My purpose in referring to the practice is to emphasize the fact that the conception of party organization implied in the rule runs counter to the American ideal. The very idea that the mayor of a city of eighty or one hundred thousand people should be responsible, not to the constituency who elected him, but to the majority of those attending the meetings of the Socialist local, perhaps less than a score of persons, and many of those not citizens, is

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

out of harmony with the best traditions of American political life.

The notion that a political party can be maintained in this country upon the basis of a social philosophy, and that any considerable number of people can be expected to attend dull and uninteresting weekly meetings, that any political campaign can be originated in the minds of men and women wholly failing to understand American political psychology, is preposterous. There is a party shibboleth which reads, "Our campaign begins the morning after election," but every honest observer of the party life knows it for the bluff it is. The thing is not possible, human beings constituted as they are. The average American citizen who participates actively in politics has a variety of other claims upon his time. In addition to the natural claims of his family, there are the claims of the church, the labor union, the fraternal orders to which he belongs, and so on. When campaign time comes he is accustomed to concentrate his efforts upon the campaign, to the exclusion of all else. For weeks, perhaps even for two or three months, his family sees very little of him and his work in every direction suffers. While the fight

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

is on he revels in it. When it is over he puts on his coat and turns once more to the things he has neglected. If the campaign is successful, there is a little rejoicing; if unsuccessful, there is the vow to do better next time. In any case, he resumes his normal way of living, his family sees more of him, and he returns to the work of the church and union and lodge.

Now this does not mean that he is only interested in campaigns. It does not mean that between campaigns he will do nothing for the interest of the party. He will not lose a chance to obtain new votes for his party. With his fellow-workers he will strive in a quiet way for his party year in and year out, but if you propose to him that he continue to give several nights a week just as he did in the campaign, he will laugh at you. A few professional politicians whom he despises do that, but for himself the idea is entirely preposterous. But that is exactly what the Socialist Party expects its members to do. What really happens is that when the campaign is over and the election returns are known, the Socialist local ceases to be an instrument for the advancement of Socialism. It becomes a little sectarian gathering, giving its time and energy to the

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

party machine. Between campaigns nine-tenths of the time and energy of the party are devoted to tinkering with the party machinery. It reminds one of the man who spends all his time under his car and never gets a chance to ride in it.

Under these circumstances the man whose time is really worth anything, who is at all capable and efficient, gives up his attendance at the local meetings, with the result that, except for the small handful of devotees whose consecration is such a wonderful inspiration to those familiar with it, the Socialist local is generally in the hands of those whose time is worthless to themselves and to others—the inefficient element which brings the party into constant disrepute. It is not strange, but perfectly natural, that there has been developed in nearly all our large cities a type of semi-professional Socialist politician into whose hands the routine work of the party more and more falls. The whole scheme of organization works to eliminate automatically the efficient part of the membership from the control of the party, and to confine that control to the least efficient and effective. It is not too much to say that in all too many instances the Socialist local is the greatest

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

obstacle in the community to the progress of Socialism. Over the door of many a Socialist local meeting-room might well be written, "All hope and faith in Socialism abandon ye who enter here."

Obviously, there must be a remedy for this condition. It is too intolerable to continue long. It is inevitable that there must be a reconstruction of the Socialist Party harmonizing with the American spirit, or a new Socialist Party born of that spirit must arise. Democratic Socialism is bound to prevail in this country, because it is the logical development of our ideals and institutions. The future of America belongs to Social Democracy; of that there can be no question. I believe that we are destined to see in the near future a new political party develop which shall be the instrument for the achievement of that great purpose. It will be a party which will not bother itself with social theories, but only with actual measures of social reconstruction. It will make its appeal not to a single class, but to all those whose interests require the development of a social democratic society, and this means the overwhelming majority of the American people. The small shop-keeper, the farmer, the professional man,

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

and the wage-earner are all of them vitally concerned in the reconstruction of our social life upon the basis of equality of economic opportunity. After all, only a small class in the nation is vitally interested in thwarting the attainment of the social democratic goal.

II

NATIONALISM: THE NEW SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

II

NATIONALISM: THE NEW SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

I

FOR a full decade intelligent observers of our political life have realized that great and far-reaching changes were taking place in the political thought of this country. At any time within that period skilled leadership could have virtually destroyed the old political alignments and created a great new political party based upon a vigorous radical program. Old political creeds are outworn and the leaders of the dominant parties have as yet failed to realize the fact. Of course there are exceptions to this rule. President Wilson, as the titular head of the Democratic Party, is a conspicuous example. He has understood the fact and courageously tried to make the Democratic Party understand it, but the fact remains that the ma-

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

jority of the leaders of that party have no sort of comprehension of the principles guiding their nominal chief. Mr. Wilson does not represent their views, and most of them would rebel against his leadership if they dared to do so. The President's real following is among that great mass of the American electorate which is utterly sick of both of the major parties, which believes in a very generous measure of collectivism in our economic life, and which responded eagerly to the trumpet call of Mr. Roosevelt in 1912 to enlist in the crusade for a very nebulous "social justice."

The Progressive Party was at best little more than a symptom of the great political unrest which for a decade has been surging through the hearts and minds of the people. The fact that 4,119,500 voters, something like 27 per cent. of the electorate, cast their vote for that party showed how easy it would be for a wisely directed movement based on sound economic principles to secure a commanding place in our political life. However much of the strength of the Progressive Party, in 1912, we are disposed to attribute to the influence of the picturesque personality of its hero and leader, it is obvious that some millions of Americans broke from their

NATIONALISM: NEW SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

political affiliations to serve, with the fervor and passion of religious devotees, a generous sentiment and a lofty social ideal.

The Progressive Party was foredoomed. The "Great Betrayal," in 1916, was simply the act of men who, on account of their personal ambitions, sought to hide the fact that the party had reached the end of its resources. It was intellectually bankrupt. Personal ambition had seized upon the widespread discontent in 1912 and given it cohesion and temporary direction. Had its leaders been possessed of economic understanding and insight instead of being mere rhetoricians whose stock in trade consisted of pious platitudes and brilliant epigrams, it would inevitably have become a great and lasting power. Instead of being a party of advanced economic ideas, it was in fact already antiquated at its birth. It began with the economic ideas and formulæ which for twenty years had been regarded as antiquated by radical economists.

If, for example, the party had boldly seized upon the fact that with the mines and transportation systems in private hands the whole economic life of America was in bondage, and had unflinchingly and aggressively advocated the national ownership of

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

the mines and railway systems of the country upon a democratic basis, its appeal would have been irresistible. The greater part of those men and women who seek a social democratic state, and have regarded the Socialist Party as an instrument to be used to that end, would have given themselves unreservedly to the new party. The average American citizen who has patiently voted the Socialist ticket has never cared anything for the elaborate social and economic theories in the party propaganda; he has wanted democratic collectivism; his interest has been in measures, not philosophies.

The Progressive Party, furthermore, missed a supremely great opportunity to enlist the support of one of the greatest moral forces in our political history—the prohibition movement. Perhaps the personal political ambitions which entered so largely into the launching of the new party were responsible for the fact that despite its vociferous insistence upon “righteousness,” the hortatory religious eloquence of its leaders, and the evangelical nature of its campaign, it was surprisingly indifferent to the greatest moral issue in American politics. Singing “Onward, Christian Soldiers,” the leaders of the party in many instances allied them-

NATIONALISM: NEW SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

selves with the liquor interests, and in general there was remarkable obliquity to the fact that the organized liquor traffic has been for many years an increasingly powerful source of corruption in our national life.

Had the leaders of the party possessed anything like the political wisdom and astuteness with which they are popularly credited, they would have understood that wherever they accepted the support of the liquor interests they were making an unprofitable bargain, because they were losing a support far more powerful and dependable. They would have realized that national prohibition of the liquor traffic at an early date was inevitable. It was inevitable because millions of men and women, not at all in sympathy with the narrow and restricted view of many Prohibitionists, had come to realize the fact that the greatest single obstacle to the peaceful and just solution of the problems of political and industrial democracy in this country is the saloon and its vicious connections. Had this great fact been sensed by the Progressive Party leaders, and prohibition of the liquor traffic been given a prominent place in the party's platform, another great element of strength would have been enlisted.

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

When the leaders of the Progressive Party, in 1916, returned to the fleshpots of Egypt, when the Holy Crusaders made common cause with the Old Guard they had so bitterly denounced in 1912, the Progressive Party, as such, ceased to exist. True, a small remnant, faithful to the covenant, refused to be delivered into the bondage of Egypt, and with splendid courage and fidelity these men and women determined to maintain the Progressive Party at all costs. At great sacrifice to themselves they kept some sort of organization alive, but for all that the Progressive Party was really a thing of the past; that which remained and bore the name was little more than a group of stand-pat idealists. Progressivism, however, remained and still remains an influential factor in our political life. The eggs once scrambled could not be unscrambled again. The liberation of millions of men and women from old party ties once achieved could not be undone.

Wherever we turn, north, south, east, or west, we find that the old political equipoise has been destroyed. California gave Mr. Wilson, a Democrat, a plurality of 4,000 votes in the last election; but it gave Hiram Johnson, Progressive candidate for Govern-

NATIONALISM: NEW SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

or, upward of 100,000 more votes than it gave to the Democratic and Republican candidates combined. In Louisiana the Republican vote was, in round figures, about 6,000, but the Progressive candidate for Governor polled over 50,000. The state of Kansas gave the Democratic candidate for President 37,000 plurality, and gave to the Republican candidate for Governor, a man of progressive views and sympathies, a plurality of 162,000. These are only a few illustrations out of many which might be cited to show the influence of independent voting, and the extent to which the American voter has been liberated from thralldom to old party bondage. The Progressive Party is dead, but the progressive spirit lives and its strength is one of the most hopeful elements in the present situation.

II

Early in the spring of 1917 certain leaders of the stand-pat Progressives entered into conference with the leaders of the national Prohibition Party. As a result of their discussions it was agreed to unite the two bodies which they represented. There was to be a merger upon the basis of a program which

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

placed in the forefront national prohibition and equal suffrage by amendments to the Federal Constitution, and the principal social reforms advocated in the Progressive platform of 1912. It soon became evident to the conferees that there were other groups of liberal thinkers in the country who might reasonably be expected to join in such a coalition, and gradually the idea of creating some kind of a league of liberals took possession of their minds.

Shortly after the agreement between the Prohibitionists and Progressives had been reached, the leaders of the merger arranged for a deputation of men and women, representing all political parties, to visit Washington in the interest of the suffrage and prohibition amendments. On one occasion a delegation consisting of prominent members of the Republican, Democratic, Progressive, Prohibition, and Socialist parties visited Washington in the interest of the prohibition amendment and presented a memorial to President Wilson, strongly urging prohibition as a war measure first of all, and, secondly, as a permanent feature of our national policy. On a subsequent occasion a similar delegation, including several of the same persons, visited the nation's capital in

NATIONALISM: NEW SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

the interest of the federal suffrage movement, appearing at hearings of the committees of the House and Senate, respectively, in support of the Susan B. Anthony amendment, and at the White House, where they held a memorable interview with President Wilson. It is permissible at this time, I think, to state that on that occasion President Wilson revealed to the members of the deputation the essential features of the policy he subsequently pursued in relation to this important matter.

On both these occasions informal conferences were held by the members of the deputations, and others, upon the general political situation; and there developed a surprising unanimity of opinion that the time had come for the creation of a new political party, pledged to a comprehensive and radical, practical program of political and industrial democracy. In these conferences there were men and women who had been affiliated with each of the dominant political parties, but were thoroughly convinced of the hopelessness of expecting any great constructive service from them. There were Socialists who believed that democratic socialism in America had been seriously injured by the fundamental inability of the

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

Socialist Party leaders to comprehend the American spirit. There were leaders of the Prohibition Party who recognized that prohibition was almost an accomplished fact and that the Prohibition Party was not to be the instrument to effect that accomplishment. There were followers of Henry George who believed that an electorate which could never be induced to accept the Single Tax theory was ready for a rational, constructive economic program in which the progressive taxation of land values created by the community should hold a conspicuous place. There were Progressives who believed that the spirit of 1912 could be enlisted in a new party, provided it were honestly and democratically conceived. Finally, there were leaders of the fight for woman suffrage who felt that their sex would not be content to enter the old parties, but would want to have a hand in the creation of a new party.

To the average observer such a description of the personnel of these conferences must be a strong temptation to indulge in cynical criticism. The suggestion of an Adullam's Cave is irresistible. The elements named are so heterogeneous and apparently conflicting that, except upon the basis of extensive compromises dictated by political

NATIONALISM: NEW SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

expediency, no sort of union for common action could be expected. But this is a very superficial view, as candid investigation will readily show. There was not the slightest suggestion of any compromise in these conferences; indeed, it was agreed by all that there should be no attempt at compromise for any reason whatever. Each person was to tell with absolute sincerity and candor, and with the utmost clarity possible, what he or she believed to be the necessary and essential features of a new political party representing the liberal thought and aspirations of the age. It is a fact that there was almost absolute unanimity of agreement upon every point.

If this seems so surprising as to be almost incredible, the reader is asked to bear in mind the conditions governing the discussions. They were not discussing social and political theories or philosophical speculations, but only concrete and specific measures. It would be impossible to get a Socialist and a Single-Taxer, for example, to agree if the discussion should take the form of an attempt to harmonize their respective philosophies or to determine which was the more worthy of support. The moment such a discussion was opened all chances of com-

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

mon understanding would be destroyed. Political parties are not based upon abstract philosophies, however, but upon definite measures and economic interests. Bearing this fact in mind, the followers of Marx and the followers of Henry George soon discovered that they were not opposed to each other; that, indeed, they have common interests. The Marxian Socialist may not, and does not, believe in the highly individualistic philosophy of the Single-Taxers, but he does believe in the principle of having the community take through taxation the unearned increment—the land values created by the community.

The Single-Taxer, on the other hand, may not, and does not, accept the Marxian philosophy, but he can and does believe in the public ownership of railroads and mines and telegraphs and telephones, and other great fundamental economic agencies. Such a program is necessary to the accomplishment of his purpose precisely as the taxation of land values is necessary to the accomplishment of the purpose of the Socialist. Thirty-odd years ago this was understood, and Single-Taxers and Socialists united for political action. Stupid and fanatical dogmatism on the part of the leaders of Socialism broke

NATIONALISM: NEW SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

down the existing unity and planted the seeds of lasting dissension. In the rediscovery of the common aims of these two important radical groups we have an event of great potential importance and value.

In like manner, other elements represented in the conferences came to a realization of the fact that the things which tended to separate them, and even to array them in antagonism to one another, were incidental and politically unimportant, while they had fundamental and vitally important aims in common. It would be impossible, perhaps, to get from any of the other elements represented agreement to the economic views of the Prohibition leaders, some of whom would doubtless have contended that the complete prohibition of the liquor traffic would of itself put an end to the existence of involuntary poverty. To permit this disagreement to be the cause of keeping them apart, and even of making them political enemies, despite the common desire for prohibition, would be exceedingly silly. All who attended the conferences were absolutely agreed without any reservation that the time had come for the elimination from this country of an industry and traffic all of whose fruits are evil, and from which no

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

single gain is derived. We were united in our belief that in order that political and industrial democracy may be realized in America the manufacture and sale of intoxicating beverages must be ended.

From this statement of the conditions which obtained in these early conferences it will be seen that the likeness to the Cave of Adullam is more apparent than real. It is, I think, a very common experience that men and women divided by the formulæ of creeds and cults and believing themselves to be fundamentally opposed, discover, whenever they abandon the formulæ and the jargon, and talk in terms of mutual understanding, that they are really very close together in their aims and should co-operate instead of fighting. Every Socialist propagandist has had the experience of advocating the Socialist program without using the label, and finding his auditors in agreement so long as the label was not applied, while the moment the word "Socialism" was attached the very persons who had approved the program were shocked into solemn opposition. This may be very stupid and inexcusable, but it is a not unimportant fact in human psychology, and the wise political thinker will not fail to take it into account.

NATIONALISM: NEW SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

Even upon the difficult question of the policy to be adopted with respect to the war the conferees found themselves in substantial agreement. No sympathizer with the German cause, no enemy of the American nation, could have derived the slightest satisfaction from any word uttered at any of these discussions. There was a united conviction that all the material and moral resources of the nation must be made available for the attainment of the democratic aims for which we had entered the war. There was no disposition to indulge in any carping criticism of the Administration, but there was a firm conviction that loyalty to the Allied cause must not be made the excuse for silent acquiescence to political reaction or extension of the power of predatory interests over the economic life of the nation. It was felt that loyalty to America required a steady and consistent fight against reaction at home, against needless restrictions of popular liberties and rights, and against profiteering. No more loyal body of Americans ever met in this country, but their loyalty was the loyalty of free men and free women. It did not exhaust itself in flag-waving and singing "The Star-Spangled Banner."

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

III

As a result of the progress made at the informal conferences above referred to, and others which were held later in New York and elsewhere, a larger conference on a more ambitious scale was arranged. An extensive correspondence with thousands of liberals in all parts of the country had been carried on, and the responses showed a remarkable degree of interest and unanimity of opinion. From every section of the country men and women representing every phase of economic life wrote enthusiastically approving the general program outlined. Leaders of organized labor, of the great farmers' organizations, the woman's movement, Socialists, Single-Taxers, Prohibitionists, Progressives—in short, men and women of every conceivable social condition and state indicated their desire to see such a party organized. The split in the Socialist Party upon the question of war policy which led many of the ablest and best-known Socialists in the country to leave that party after the adoption of the notorious resolution of the St. Louis convention resulted in the formation of the Social Democratic League of America, a non-partisan national society

NATIONALISM: NEW SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

for the propaganda of Socialism. Many of the men and women active in this movement were exceedingly anxious to see a new party launched. The result of all this activity was the holding, in July, 1917, of a four-day conference at Morristown, New Jersey, at the home of Mr. J. A. H. Hopkins.

At this conference the subject of the Non-Partisan League of the northwest and its political significance was thoroughly discussed. The promoters of the conference had been in close touch with the great farmers' movement and were fully informed concerning it. They realized that it was governed autocratically and that its methods could not be closely copied by a party which sought to make a general political appeal to the electorate. They realized, furthermore, that the non-partisan principle could not be permanently maintained; that the inevitable result must be either the development of a party or submergence into an existing party. Non-partisanship in American politics means for any great movement, sooner or later, political horse-trading and consequent disintegration and defeat. It was therefore agreed that any organization attempted must take the form of a new party

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

having for its aim the realization of complete political and industrial democracy.

It was not a difficult matter for the conferees to agree upon the main outlines of a program. The previous conferences and the extensive correspondence which had been conducted had led to a fairly complete understanding. Of course there was need for a good deal of discussion and exposition in order that there might be full assurance that the agreement was not a superficial result of using words to which no common interpretation was attached. It was not enough, for example, to say that they believed in political democracy. Mr. Elihu Root is quite ready to avow his belief in political democracy, and for that matter it would not be surprising if the Emperor of Germany should be equally ready to do so. Obviously, however, Mr. Root's political democracy would not satisfy any man or woman with a twentieth-century conception of life.

The conferees agreed that any political party representing their hopes and aspirations must stand for democracy in government, in industry, and in international relations. Anything short of this comprehensive application of democracy to the major

NATIONALISM: NEW SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

interests of individual and collective life must fail to satisfy the profound challenge of the heart and brain of American civilization. There must be the widest possible diffusion of political power in order that the government may be responsive to the will and conscience of the people; there must be a radical rearrangement of our economic life to the end that the advantages of our industrial organization and genius may be freely shared by all the people, and that every child born into the land may be given equal economic opportunity. Finally, there must be between nations the same governing principle of equal opportunity to the end that all peoples, great and small, may freely enjoy the right to develop their own lives and share in the opportunities for rich and joyous living.

Inspired by these ideals, arrangements were made for the holding of a still larger conference on a national scale, and for presenting to that conference the draft of a platform for consideration as a possible basis for the union of the forward-looking forces of the nation. Up to this time there had been no hitch or difficulty, no serious misunderstanding; but when it came to the question of deciding upon a name for the new party which it was

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

proposed to create, there was an immediate controversy and one which threatened for the time to disrupt the conference. The potency of tags and labels to hold men's allegiance was admirably illustrated. Naturally the Prohibitionists and Progressives were equally desirous of preserving the names which had meant so much to them. As naturally other groups were unwilling to accept these names with their ineradicable associations. The legal complications, moreover, were numerous and intricate. The electoral laws of many of the states seemed to have been devised with the purpose of making it well-nigh impossible to create new political organizations. Many of the states insist that the party designation must consist of not more than two words, and most of the states justly insist that no party shall use as its name, or any part of its name, the name, or any part of the name, of an existing political party.

These restrictions make impossible combinations which naturally suggest themselves. It would be impossible to have a Progressive Prohibition Party or a Progressive Socialist Party, for instance. All sorts of names were suggested and discussed, most of them utterly impossible. For a time it

NATIONALISM: NEW SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

seemed as if the conference might agree upon the name Commonweal Party until an acute journalist observed that within a week the party would be popularly known as the "Common Squeal" Party. Finally it was agreed to leave the matter of the name to the larger conference to be subsequently held, and it is worthy of remark that the name National Party, which was adopted by the larger conference, was the only name suggested which had not even been mentioned at Morristown.

IV

The conference which met in Chicago in October, 1917, and created a temporary organization for the National Party adopted a tentative platform which is in many respects the most remarkable political platform ever issued by a minor party. It might be called either a conservative radical or a radical conservative document. It is unique in one important respect: there is not a word of protest or denunciation in it from the first sentence to the last. Nothing is condemned or viewed with alarm. From end to end it is wholly affirmative and constructive. It is not the statement of a party

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

of protest, but the program of a party with a constructive aim.

The platform may fairly be described as the most scientifically constructed political platform ever adopted by any party. Whatever the practical political outcome of the experiment, the attempted coalition of the liberal groups and parties produced the most comprehensive statement of the principles of political and industrial democracy ever made in a political instrument of this character. Democracy, the *kratos*, or rule, of the *Demos*, the people, is set forth with logic and sincerity. There is no indulgence in outworn platitudes. The aim of the party is declared to be "the attainment of democracy in government, in industry, and in our international relations," and an attempt is made to map out the successive steps which must be taken in order that that end may be reached.

Of course the platform declares for equal suffrage without regard to sex. There can be no complete democracy in government so long as one-half of the adult inhabitants are excluded from enjoyment of the privileges of the franchise. Suffrage for all women, through the enactment of an amendment to the Federal Constitution, is one of

NATIONALISM: NEW SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

the measures upon which all liberals are agreed. That is the irreducible minimum of political democracy.

But mere equality of suffrage is not certain to give us democracy in government. It is possible for the people to be ruled from above, even where universal equal suffrage exists. It does not follow that because the right to elect lawmakers and executives is widely diffused through the body politic that government will be readily responsive to the people's will. That is the essence of democracy; nothing else is worthy of the name. Some guarantees are needed to insure that the officials whom the people elect will represent them faithfully and really express the will of the electors.

The platform advocates the Initiative, Referendum, and Right of Recall, thus giving to the people the right to initiate and reject legislation and the power to remove elected officials from office. It favors proper safeguards against the abuse of these democratic powers. The action of the Massachusetts Constitutional Convention favoring an amendment to the state constitution providing for these forms of direct government has given a new interest to them.

The right of the people to originate and

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

finally pass upon legislation has come to be accepted as a fundamental democratic right. It cannot be said that this is an experiment. There is a very ample body of experience, both American and European, which justifies the claim that these instruments of popular sovereignty reduce public abuses to a minimum. The very existence of the right is frequently so effective that its exercise is quite unnecessary. Direct legislation has a tendency to make laws simpler and easier to understand. It certainly makes it easier to get serious consideration for important social and political reforms, and it promotes an intelligent study of public questions by the electorate, with the result that the standard of the legislative bodies where direct legislation prevails is very much higher than elsewhere.

There will never be a genuine rule of the people until there is a far-reaching reform in our election laws which will remove the minor political offices from electoral contests. The citizen who is confronted at the polls with a blanket ballot eight or nine feet by half as many, containing a long list of candidates for many offices, is in no position—unless he is a professional politician—to exercise an intelligent choice in his voting.

NATIONALISM: NEW SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

He knows the views and the qualifications of a small number of candidates for the offices which are most conspicuously in the public mind, but he cannot be informed concerning a much larger number of candidates, those for the minor offices especially. In the circumstances he must vote in the dark if he votes for the filling of these offices; he is the helpless tool of the political bosses.

As the platform of this new political party points out, there are other important political reforms which must be effected before we can realize a full-rounded democracy in government. Instead of the present method of providing for governmental expenditures by separate and unrelated appropriation bills, there should be an executive budget, a schedule of proposed expenditures prepared in advance by responsible administrative officials and submitted to the legislative body for discussion. The vast expenditures necessary for the carrying out of the increasingly heavy tasks of government make this a reform of the utmost importance.

The I. W. W. and other manifestations of Syndicalism in this country bear witness to the fact that the problem of migratory labor which is practically disfranchised is a most serious matter for a democratic nation.

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

The worst phases of this Syndicalist menace, including the extensive propaganda of sabotage, can be directly traced to the fact that a large part of the unskilled, migratory laborers of the country are excluded from the exercise of the franchise through the operation of our election laws. They must follow their jobs and are therefore unable to meet the requirements as to fixed residence, registration, and so on. The National Party platform does not cover this whole question, but it takes a long step forward in demanding that some provision be made for "absentee voting"—that is, that the voter who has changed his residence since the last registration, or who is obliged to move to another city, or who may be temporarily absent from home, shall have the right to vote by affidavit, wherever he may be. The voting of our conscript army in the camps, both at home and abroad, would seem to have demonstrated the practicability of this measure. Once adopted, the migratory laborers of the country will have a political channel through which they can express their criticism and discontent; they will not be forced, as they now practically are, to resort to the methods of Syndicalistic "direct action."

NATIONALISM: NEW SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

One of the most important of the measures for the democratizing of our system of government is that which demands that members of the President's Cabinet should be seated in Congress, without votes, and subject to interpellation by the elected representatives of the people. The object is to make the actual government of the country immediately subject to criticism by the people's elected representatives and responsive to the popular will.

At the present time it is easily possible for the people to elect a liberal, forward-looking Congress, but for the actual government of the nation to be reactionary. It is possible to have a Post Office Department ruled by the most illiberal mind in the country, simply because the President made an unwise selection. Moreover, it is possible for the gravest abuses to go on for a long time quite unchecked. We have had numerous examples of the manner in which, under our present system, evils are permitted to go on unchecked until there is a scandal. Then we resort to silly, expensive, time-wasting, and frequently dishonest investigations. We are in danger of developing a system of government by Congressional investigation. As it is, we have a very irre-

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

sponsible government, tempered by investigation.

This is not a new proposal; it is not a sample of the freakish legislation so commonly found in the platforms of minor parties. As far back as 1881 a Congressional Committee, which included such men as James G. Blaine, John J. Ingalls, and William B. Allison, unanimously reported a bill providing that members of the Cabinet should have seats in the House of Representatives and the Senate, with the right to participate in debate on matters relating to their respective departments, and that they be required to attend the sessions of the House and Senate on certain days in the week to answer questions and give information. Had we such a system in operation the recent investigations of the War Department would not have been necessary.

In addition to the planks which I have described with some detail, the tentative platform contains demands for the complete suppression of the liquor traffic, and the total prohibition of the manufacture and sale of intoxicating beverages; for far-reaching prison reform looking to the restoration of the character and social efficiency of the prisoner; and for a system of propor-

NATIONALISM: NEW SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

tional representation, to the end that every political group and party may secure representation according to its numerical voting strength.

v

The definition of industrial democracy is even more difficult than is the definition of political democracy. The root idea conveyed by the phrase is that the industrial life of the nation must, like its government, be made subject to the rule of the people. The phrase stands for an ideal rather than for a specific program. The ideal is that of equality of economic opportunity. Just as in political government there must be the widest possible diffusion of opportunity to shape the laws, so in our industrial organization there must be the widest possible diffusion of the power and opportunity to share in the direction of the industrial processes and enjoyment of their fruits. "It is fundamental to industrial democracy," says the platform, "that there shall be equality of economic opportunity, and that the economic life of the nation shall be responsive to the people's will."

Obviously, we are far from such a condition at present. Aided by special privileges

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

conferred by legislative bodies, and taking advantage of the industrial development of a century of feverish progress, a small minority of our citizens have come to control a vast majority of the national capital. This class owns the great systems of transportation and communication, the circulatory system upon which the national life depends. We have come recently to recognize what the Socialists have always known, that the ownership of the railways, telegraphs, and telephones of a nation gives to the owners the virtual control of the life of the nation and the power to exploit it.

What is true of these so-called "artificial monopolies" is equally true of the group of agencies which some economists call "natural monopolies"—land, mines, forests, oil-wells, natural-gas deposits, water-power, and so on. These, as well as the great bulk of the manufacturing machinery of the country, which is rapidly being monopolized, are owned and controlled by a minority of the population, and by that minority exploited for their gain. In a word, all the great fundamental economic resources of this nation are available to the majority of the population only on the sufferance of a privileged owning class, and upon its terms.

NATIONALISM: NEW SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

It is trite and commonplace to say that at the bottom of the whole economic question is the land question. It is not necessary to be a disciple of Henry George to recognize this elementary fact. Man is a land animal, and the ownership and use of land are among the first of his economic concerns. All great popular movements in politics have wrestled with the important subject of land monopoly. They have recognized that land monopoly destroys economic freedom: the two are mutually exclusive. Thomas Jefferson recognized that important truth when he wrote to James Madison, in 1785: "Wherever there are in any country uncultivated lands and unemployed poor it is clear that the laws of property have been so far extended as to violate natural right. The earth has been given as a common stock for man to labor and live upon."

This doctrine of "natural right" sounds strangely to our modern ears, but it was still alive when the American Free Soil Party, the forerunner of the Republican Party, was organized. That party declared in its platform, in 1852, "that all men have a natural right to a portion of the soil, and that as the use of the soil is indispensable to life, the right of all men to the soil is as

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

sacred as the right to life itself." This somewhat crude Agrarian communism found an echo forty years later in the platform of the People's Party, which declared that "the land, including all the natural sources of wealth, is the heritage of the people, and should not be monopolized for speculative purposes."

Two great comprehensive programs for dealing with this problem have been developed. First of all there is the proposal to nationalize the land, to do away with the private ownership of all land and make the state the sole and exclusive landowner. Under this plan the individual citizen would be a tenant of the state and have a use title to a given piece of land for such a time as the state might determine. The other method is to leave the ownership titles untouched, but to appropriate through taxation the rental value which land acquires as a natural and inevitable result of the presence of population and its necessary expenditures. The one method is land nationalization; the other is land-value taxation.

It is a mistake to suppose, as many do, that Henry George was the first to advocate the taxation of the rental value of land. George never made such a claim. As a mat-

NATIONALISM: NEW SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

ter of fact, the proposal was one of the commonplaces of economic literature long before George's justly famous work appeared. Even Karl Marx and his associates advocated it in 1848. What George did was to develop the theory—already formulated by the Physiocrats in France—that the systematic and consistent taxation of land values would give the state all the revenue it required, enabling it to dispense with all other forms of taxation, direct and indirect; that as a result unemployment and involuntary poverty would disappear from society and the social problem would be solved.

It is not necessary for any one to accept George's theory in order to believe in the justness and the wisdom of imposing a tax upon the site-rental value of land, so that the increment which comes as a result, not of the efforts of the landowner, but because of the presence and the expenditures of society, may not be taken by the landowner, but by society, which created it. Nor is it necessary to agree with George that no other form of taxation should be tolerated; that neither incomes nor inheritances should be taxed, for example. I believe equally in all three forms of taxation. This important distinction between the Single-

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

Tax theory of Henry George and the taxation of land values, which is only one element in that theory, should be borne in mind.

The men and women who formulated the tentative platform of the National Party had no intention of indorsing the Single-Tax doctrine. As a matter of fact, they agreed to incorporate in the platform at a later date demands for the taxation of incomes and inheritances, and selected a committee to formulate those demands. This seems to be a necessary explanation in view of the extent to which the idea that it was a Single-Tax party prevailed. Their attitude was that the annual increase in the value of land, being due to the presence of population and its imperative expenditures, and in no wise the result of the thrift, industry, or virtue of the landowner, should be taken in the form of taxation as a part of the social revenue. They believed that no far-reaching comprehensive program of social reconstruction is possible in this or any other country unless land values are taxed for the common good. In a word, they took the same position as Lloyd George took in the famous pre-war budget which won him the hatred of the predatory interests of England.

NATIONALISM: NEW SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

The declaration in the platform is very brief and very simple. It urges: "Removal of the fundamental evil of land monopoly by taxation of site-rental values, this taxation to be progressively increased and taxation of improvements to be gradually abolished."

In considering this demand it is important to begin at the beginning and to remember a few fundamental facts. *It is not proposed to interfere with land-ownership titles.* It is neither necessary nor wise to do this. On the contrary, the owner who is actually putting his land to some use should be given even greater security of possession than he now has. Only speculation and holding land in idleness should be penalized in any manner. About five per cent. of the people in the United States own most of the urban, suburban, and agricultural land of the country. They derive from this ownership an annual net rent of between four and five billions of dollars.

It is to the interest of the great mass of the people to have land made cheap and easily accessible. This is especially the case with urban and suburban land. Dear land is invariably a hardship to the mass of the people, because it increases the cost of living

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

and intensifies the struggle for existence. Now, land differs from everything else that man uses in one very important particular: Whereas an increase of taxation upon anything else that man uses and needs for his life always increases the cost of that thing, taxation imposed upon land always has the effect of cheapening it. A tax upon bread makes bread dearer immediately; a tax upon stoves, silk shirts, sugar, bicycles, telephones, or anything else, increases the cost of the thing taxed and tends to restrict its use. The taxation of land has a precisely opposite effect. Place a tax upon land values and it immediately results in making land cheaper. If all existing taxes upon land values were removed, the immediate result would be to make land much dearer and harder to obtain. If an existing tax upon any commodity is removed, on the other hand, that commodity becomes cheaper and easier to obtain.

Obviously, the taxation of land values is opposed to the interest of the five per cent. who profit by the existing system, and they are vigorously opposed to it. As obviously, it is to the interest of the rest of the population. Wherever land values are taxed land that is held for speculation is put to use and

NATIONALISM: NEW SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

the result is lower rents, increased industrial activity, less unemployment, and less poverty. The present writer does not believe that the taxation of land values alone will result in the extinction of poverty, but he does believe that it will contribute materially to that much-desired result. The simple justice of the taxation of land values is incontestable. Land values are not produced by the individuals who, under the present system, enjoy them. They are not the product of labor and capital in the same sense that industrial values are, but are solely the result of community life and activity.

This question of the taxation of land values is very intimately bound up in what is destined to become the most pressing of the great problems of reconstruction which must be faced and solved after the war, the problem of arranging for the payment of the cost of the war in a democratic manner that will avoid the crime of saddling vast burdens of indebtedness upon succeeding generations. It is almost impossible to conceive that any statesman will ever be able to devise a program for the democratic payment of our war indebtedness without providing for a heavy taxation of land values as one source of revenue.

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

VI

It is now universally admitted that no reorganization of our economic life upon the basis of democracy is possible except through a more or less extensive adoption of public ownership. In the sense that we are all agreed upon this fundamental proposition, we are, in the language of a great British statesman, "all Socialists now." The only question is where we are to stop; how far and how fast we are to go.

The authors of the great political document we are discussing faced this important question in a true American spirit. They did not theorize about it. Discarding all social theories, they addressed themselves to the realities of American life and tabulated the things and functions vitally important to the life of the nation which have fallen into private hands. They faced the inevitable and inescapable logic of facts and reached the conclusion that they must "favor a policy of public ownership to be progressively applied to the organized industries of the nation." They anticipated in a striking manner the now historic program of the British Labor Party.

The platform advocates specifically the

NATIONALISM: NEW SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

“public ownership and democratic control of coal and metal mines, water-power, natural-gas and oil wells, steam and electric railroads, telegraph and telephone services, water-works, light and power plants, terminal warehouses and elevators, and all other public utilities and basic industries whose operations depend on franchises, or that require large-scale operation on a non-competitive or centralized basis.” This is a very concrete and definite program. It is not a nebulous thing.

When the platform was adopted as a tentative basis for a liberal coalition, there were fears that it might be too radical. Advocacy of the public ownership of the railroads of America was generally regarded as a revolutionary proposal—“unfortunately quite utopian.” Within an incredibly short time the pressing needs of the war had forced the government to take possession of practically the entire railway system of the country. It was impossible to obtain efficiency so long as the railways were owned by capitalist corporations. As in every other country, it was discovered that capitalist operation did not and could not result in a maximum of efficiency.

For upward of two years—in fact, ever

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

since the first months of the war in Europe—the utter failure of our transportation system had been apparent to all serious students of our economic problems. Early in 1917 the shortage of cars had become so great that conditions were exceedingly critical, yet nothing of serious consequence was done about it. With the greater part of the civilized world at war, with the menace of war hanging over us like a dark cloud, we witnessed the railroad operators of the country helpless in the presence of a breakdown of the transportation system of the country—which is to our economic life what the arteries are to the human organism. Capitalism was revealed in all its fundamental ineptitude and weakness.

In many sections of the country there was, even as early as the opening months of 1917, a fuel famine so serious that many individual industries had to suspend operations. Others were obliged to suspend on account of car shortage or freight congestion. With a fuel famine in some parts of the country, and the certainty that the reserve stocks of fuel were far below the line of safety, coal-mines were actually closed down for part of the time, alike in the anthracite and bituminous mine regions. Coal sorely needed, miners

NATIONALISM: NEW SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

idle and anxious to work—was ever a more tragic exhibition of the failure of a great industrial system? The reason for this anomalous condition was the breakdown of transportation. Cars were lacking, and there was no serious attempt to meet the need, though one would have supposed that our industrial resources would have been equal to meeting such a need very quickly. Building freight-cars is not a very long or a very intricate job. Meanwhile, the most criminally stupid policy of handling the freight traffic of the country prevailed, while conditions in all parts of the country grew steadily worse. A group of Russian Bolsheviks, without any previous training, could have been relied upon to have made a better use of the existing facilities, inadequate as these admittedly were. They could not possibly have done worse!

Once again the farmers saw the food crops they had raised go to waste because the railroads were mismanaged. In other years they had seen their crops rot in the fields because the railroads could not provide cars to move them, the while there were in other parts of the country thousands of idle cars. There was no brain back of the railroad system of the country, save the greedy brain

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

of the counting-room. As early as January, 1917, the Interstate Commerce Commission called attention to the seriousness of the situation. The commission pointed out that mills had been forced to shut down; that hundreds of car-loads of food products had been destroyed through delay in delivery; that perishable products of great value had been destroyed and their value utterly lost. The aggregate of losses from the anarchy in the transportation system had cost already hundreds of millions—possibly billions—of dollars. Moreover, the fate of the whole nation in the most critical period of its history was at stake. Yet the railroads continued as before, content apparently to drift. The operators of the railways permitted each month to be worse than the month which preceded it. They were not quite idle, it is true: they manifested remarkable activity in their efforts to secure increased freight rates amounting to half a billion dollars!

If it be urged that the anarchy of the transportation system was in large part due to the restrictions which had been placed upon the railroads by twenty-five years of regulatory legislation, that fact can be cheerfully admitted by the advocate of public ownership. That is one of the prime reasons

NATIONALISM: NEW SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

for public ownership, not a defense of private ownership. In the very nature of the case, it was not possible, and never can be possible, for the state to permit the combination of the railroads, so long as they are operated for private profit, to the extent which their efficient operation demands. Practically all the legislation against combination, rate agreements, and the like is an interference with the efficiency of the railroads. That is obvious to the student who takes the trouble to study the facts. But it is equally obvious that the legislation was and is necessary for the protection of the public against the inexorable workings of the law of unrestrained capitalism.

The situation as regards the railroads has been as follows: we have had hundreds of railroads, each run as a separate concern, not in any effective manner co-ordinated with the hundreds of other roads in the country. The most elementary knowledge of the problem suffices to emphasize the fact that there could never be efficiency under such conditions. The railroad system of the country should be a carefully organized whole operating as a single unit. Probably as much as sixty per cent. of the energy and cost of railroad operation during the past twenty-

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

five years has been a needless and indefensible waste. Think of the competition between the individual roads for business; the great army of agents and solicitors employed and the enormous expenditures for competitive advertising. Think, too, of the fabulous sums wasted in providing and maintaining separate, competing terminals. The money invested needlessly in this one item of waste would have maintained the rolling stock of the entire railroad system at the point of maximum efficiency, provided, of course, there were constructive brains behind its expenditure.

At every point we encounter the same great all-important fact that the fundamental law of private ownership is incompatible with social efficiency in the operation of great social agencies like the transportation system. With numerous railroads, incoordinated and following no common purpose, each seeking only its own advantage and profit, we have had, time and again, the efficiency of one line crippled by reason of a lack of cars, while another near-by line had its freight terminals and sidings congested with empty cars. Moreover, we have witnessed, time and again, the spectacle of one road striving by all means in its power to

NATIONALISM: NEW SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

keep another competing road short of cars. And throughout the entire history of the railroads of America the motive dominating their operation has been private profit. The most profitable traffic has been most sought and favored. If greater profits could be made from the transportation of luxuries than from the transportation of absolutely necessary things like foodstuffs, the luxuries have been transported and the foodstuffs neglected. Crops have been permitted to rot simply because the railroads cared more for business which netted larger returns. If it were possible to compute what this policy has cost the nation in the increase of the cost of living and the loss of economic efficiency, the sum would be so colossal as to stagger humanity. It was testified at hearings of the Federal Trade Commission that cars had been diverted from the coal trade, for example, to meet the demand for automobile transportation, forcing the price of coal up as much as two dollars per ton. Sometimes the railroads have used their power to force the mine-owners to fix the price of coal at the level set by the roads.

There is no escape from the fact that if we are to get the maximum of efficiency from our transportation we must take it out of

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

private hands and subject it to public ownership and control. In no other way can we get a 100-per-cent. return in service. The fault lies not with individual measures. It is not a question of managerial incompetence, but of the inherent weakness of the system. Private ownership of railroads is just as senseless as public ownership of tooth-brushes would be. The economic life of the nation is pivoted upon its railroads and its mines. To permit those to be governed by the interests of a small group of people is to subject the economic life of the nation to a despotism which makes free development impossible. We must have a unification of our entire transportation system controlled by the objective of the largest possible social service instead of the objective of the maximum profits for invested capital.

The railroad system of the nation must never be permitted to revert to private control. Such an act would, in the face of the accumulated evidence of universal experience, be a crime against civilization. It would be a far greater disaster to the American people than the invasion and conquest of the country by German armies would be. Of course, the vested interests will not easily and silently relinquish their power to prey.

NATIONALISM: NEW SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

They will fight desperately to have the railroads returned to them. It becomes necessary for every intelligent American patriot to resist to the uttermost the attempt to place the economic life of the nation in bondage.

There is no question of the ability of modern governments to operate their railroad systems efficiently. No matter how poor the mental equipment of the officials selected by the government for the task, nor how greatly their selection was influenced by mere machine politics, they could not possibly mismanage the railroads to such an extent as to produce such chaos and inefficiency as have universally resulted under private ownership. The ablest minds in private service, consecrated by the loftiest passion for efficiency, could not produce from the hundreds of privately owned railroads as good results as the most ordinary managers could produce from a unified service. This is the great central fact which the American people must recognize: capitalism is inherently inefficient and incapable of producing from mines and railroads the maximum of efficient service. The very structure of public ownership, the law of its own life, impels it to pursue a course which is unified and consistent.

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

The assumption that public ownership would result in the placing of the railroads in the hands of managers of lower caliber than those employed by the railroad companies is, however, wholly untenable. It is the universal experience that wherever modern governments undertake great economic services and functions they draw into the public service men of the very highest type. Other things being equal, the great organizer prefers to serve the government rather than private interests, even at a lower salary. The public esteem which attaches to the service of the community brings with it a gratification which the servant of the private and profit-making corporation can never know. Public ownership of railroads and mines, for example, would inevitably elevate the whole tone and character of our public life and our politics. The difficulty in the past has been that the great vital functions of the nation have been carried on for private profit, with the result that all the best minds of the nation, naturally attracted by the greatest and most vital undertakings, have been in private instead of public service, and when they have done what the needs of the services required they have become lawbreakers. Under capitalism creative brains have been

NATIONALISM: NEW SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

always in danger of jail! Whenever the nation assumes the great fundamental economic functions it will command the services of its Schwabs, its Rockefellers, and its Garys.

Finally, the fear that such a wide extension of the principle of public ownership will lead to a great increase in graft and political corruption rests upon a fallacy which can be easily detected. The underlying assumption that private ownership is free from graft and corruption is so naïve and so contrary to all the available evidence that it is scarcely comprehensible how intelligent minds can make it. The pages of testimony given before the numerous government investigations bear eloquent witness to the fact that the greatest single source of corruption of our political life has been the railroad interests of the country. The story of the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad, for example, is the story of unbridled corruption and the most infamous conspiracy of private interests against the common welfare ever recorded in the history of any people. Wherever great privileges and franchises give private interests an opportunity to control the public service for profit there the greed of private interests poisons and corrupts the

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

political life of the nation. The only remedy for this corruption is public ownership, and it is the testimony of every competent observer that every extension of collectivism, whether national or municipal, has had the effect of eliminating graft and elevating the moral tone of politics and government. The new Nationalism, in demanding the wide extension of public ownership and authority, is not only pointing the way to greater economic efficiency, but to the purging of our political life from its greatest moral disease.

VII

The authors of the declaration of principles of the new Nationalism recognized clearly that there are very definite limits to the sphere of public ownership. The law and the logic of public ownership and democratic direction can apply only to those things, tools, processes, and functions which are essentially collectivistic in character and which cannot be subject to private ownership and individual or even group direction without serious menace to the well-being of the body social. Communism is not a principle of industrial democracy; it is only the communism of opportunity which breeds

NATIONALISM: NEW SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

individualism of aspiration and achievement that industrial democracy requires.

In addition to the guarantee of equality of economic opportunity the new industrial democracy that is emerging from the weltering chaos of our economic system must and will provide great incentive and well-considered encouragement to private initiative in industrial enterprise, and to the fullest individual liberty that is consistent with social well-being. Otherwise it is to be feared there must be a paralysis of that adventurous spirit which has been the mainspring of human progress. It is vital to the life of society that the individual citizen should be free to embark upon new industrial enterprises and to experiment with new technical industrial processes. The new industrial democracy, if it is to succeed, must be as definitely inspired by individualism as by Socialism. One great weakness in the Socialist propaganda of the past has been the failure to distinguish between unearned increment and the incomes derived from legitimate and productive services.

The man who sees the need for some new departure in production and who creates a new industry, and the man who sees the weakness of a prevailing technical method

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

and devises the necessary improvements to make it efficient, are not exploiters of industry. Their net incomes should be regarded as fair wages for the useful experiment performed and the social service rendered. There can be no rational objection to the continuance of such private enterprise so long as the gains derived therefrom are earned without injury to the community. Private enterprise which does not demonstrably serve the common good may well be checked in the interest of the community and some limit may well be placed upon the amount of income permissible as a reward for private enterprise. These things are in the very nature of social organization, but private enterprise in industry is too valuable a social force to be abandoned in obedience to doctrinaires.

Naturally the task of applying democratic principles to the management of the publicly owned economic functions is one of the most difficult of all the problems to be faced. There can be no industrial democracy if public ownership is to be dominated by a bureaucracy which becomes essentially an economic caste. On the other hand, there can be no efficiency if the important and essential economic functions are to be sub-

NATIONALISM: NEW SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

ject to the control of the electorate rather than to that of the expert. Modern industry can no more be carried on under the direction of electoral majorities than wars can be fought by referenda of the soldiers or orchestras conducted by majority vote.

The claim of the Syndicalist that industries must be directed solely by those employed in them is wholly undemocratic. In the name of democracy Syndicalism would erect an economic hierarchy far more oppressive and menacing to the common well-being than the capitalist system itself. In the case of the railroads, for example, the national life would be just as insecure, and in the long run as badly served, if the railways were governed exclusively by the railway workers as was the case under capitalist management. It is probable that the results would be even worse; that the general standard of technical efficiency would be considerably lowered. Ownership and control of the railways by an industrial group is just as undesirable as their ownership and control by an investing group.

In the course of its evolution modern capitalism has developed two great instrumentalities whose potential value is vastly greater even than their already great achieve-

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

ments. They are the industrial corporation and the labor union. The tentative platform of this new liberal coalition wisely declares that:

“Any form of public ownership which should neglect those instrumentalities, and give over the management of our industries to a mere political bureaucracy, would arouse the well-merited opposition of all classes. Both the workers and the expert business managers of industry must be protected from the unenlightened tyranny of public officials, and similarly the body of citizens as a whole must be protected from monopolistic extortions on the part of industrial groups. The chief industries should be controlled by administrative boards upon which the workers, the managers, and the government should all be represented.”

Obviously this statement is to be regarded merely as an intimation of a fundamental idea rather than as a definite plan. It is somewhat nebulous and vague, but, the principle once accepted, the development of a plan should be relatively easy. As a matter of fact, in the representation of the two groups, the managerial and the industrial, upon the directing bodies in control of great collective functions, as, for example, in the

NATIONALISM: NEW SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

case of the French railways, we have a fairly definite idea of the manner in which this principle can be constructively applied.

In the progressive development of the industrial democracy for which we are striving there must needs be an enlightened and progressive program for dealing with the great agrarian problem, the importance of which becomes increasingly evident. Probably no single measure will do more to contribute to the solution of this problem than the public ownership of the lines of transportation. To this must be added public ownership and operation of the facilities for storage and marketing, including the grain-elevators and packing-plants. Some form of governmental insurance of stock and crops against natural calamities must be developed. Eventually there can be no place in an industrial democracy for speculation and gambling in the grain and food stocks of the nation.

The spirit of the new Nationalism demands that the efforts of the labor unions to improve industrial conditions shall be given every possible support. Organized labor is not always right, being a human institution; it makes many mistakes because it is human. It has, however, made splendid con-

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

tributions of inestimable value to the progress of civilization and must be given a foremost place among the great forces of enlightenment and progress.

The new movement toward industrial democracy stands wholly committed to the main features of the legislative program of the organized labor movement of America. It would insist upon the standards of union labor being observed in all industrial establishments engaged in government work, no matter whether such establishments are owned and operated by the government or by private contractors. The progressive reduction of the hours of labor, the insurance by the government of all workers against sickness, accident, old age, and death, and the abolition of child labor, are principles which have the sanction of the enlightened opinion of mankind. Furthermore, it has become evident that as the state extends its supervisory powers over industry the labor organizations must be given an important share in that service. Upon every board or commission created for the management of publicly owned industries or enterprises, or for the regulation of private enterprises, the workers should be adequately represented through representatives chosen by their unions.

NATIONALISM: NEW SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

In this sketch of the main principles which must govern any efficient movement for industrial democracy there is no single measure or principle proposed which has not been tested by actual practice and found to be of definite value. This is the pragmatic test. We are not asked to rely upon social theories or dogmas, but to accept the plain teachings of experience.

VIII

If democracy is needed in domestic government and in the organization of our economic life, it is even more necessary in our international relations. The foreign policies of a democratic nation cannot be permitted to remain subject to undemocratic principles. To democratize the relations of all civilized nations with one another is one of the profound challenges which the times bring to the heart and brain of the world.

The conflict between democratic idealism and secret diplomacy is obvious. The making of secret treaties and of agreements by governments without the sanction of their peoples has in the past been a prolific cause of international misunderstandings and wars, perhaps even the principal cause. That is one evil which it is in our power to remove. The

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

time has come to assert the determination of our people that the government of the United States shall, in the councils of nations, insist that in the future the sanction of the peoples shall be made essential to any treaties or agreements made between civilized nations. Just as there should be no treaty or agreement made by this nation except with the sanction of Congress in open session, we should accept the signature of no government unless it is authorized by the expressed will of the people of the nation which that government claims to represent. The goal of democracy in international relations is the development of a Republic of the World. In that republic there must be equal opportunity for all nations, whether great or small, to develop their own lives and cultures within the bounds of international law.

Some international tribunal must be constituted in such a fashion as to represent the small and weak nations equally with the large and powerful ones for the settlement of international controversies and disputes. There must be some sort of league of nations charged with the special function of maintaining the peace of the world and enforcing the principle of international equality of opportunity. Only upon this condition, it

NATIONALISM: NEW SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

would appear, will the disarmament of nations be feasible or safe. Certainly the world cannot continue upon the old basis of competitive armaments. It is equally certain that it cannot be safe for democracy to have the democratic nations disarm themselves while the autocratic nations retain their military and naval establishments. The substitution of international armed force for that of nations is the only solution to the problem.

Ultimately the peace of the world and the attainment of international democracy require international free trade. The imposition by any nation or group of nations of prohibitory taxation or discriminatory tariffs on trade and commerce must be made impossible. Discrimination in trading opportunities cannot fail to produce resentment and the peril of war. Free trade is a democratic ideal, the vital importance of which to the practical life of the world has been made increasingly manifest by the tragedy of the past four years.

In this program for the application of democracy to the three great primary divisions of the political and economic life of the world—its national governments, its economic systems, and its international rela-

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

tions—there is nothing that is incompatible with the basic ideals of our American civilization. On the contrary, it may fairly be claimed that a generous interpretation of the ideals expressed in the Declaration of Independence must lead inevitably to very similar, if not identical, conclusions. However imperfect the program may be—and its authors recognize the imperfections perhaps more clearly than any of their critics can do—it affords a firm and sound basis for common effort to realize the noblest aspirations of mankind.

III

SOCIALISM AND
INTERNATIONALISM

III

SOCIALISM AND INTERNATIONALISM ¹

I

THE ideal of internationalism is older than any existing nation. It is older than the Christian religion; but as the *credo* of a great movement, the inspiration of millions, it is a modern phenomenon. It is the great merit of Socialism—grudgingly conceded by its bitterest opponents—that it has implanted in the breasts of millions of earnest souls in all lands a passionate love for all mankind, a sense of international fraternity.

Even before Marx Socialism in its utopian form was deeply impregnated with the spirit of internationalism. Saint-Simon, whose Socialism was profoundly religious, identified

¹ *Atlantic Monthly*, September, 1917.

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

it with international solidarity. And while it is impossible to conceive of two thinkers more unlike than the gentle French mystic and the stern German realist, Marx was greatly influenced in his thinking by the author of the *Nouveau Christianisme*.

Marx made internationalism the religion of a class in revolt, thus infusing it with a burning passion. Thanks to Marx, international solidarity became the object of impassioned faith:

*C'est la lutte finale,
Marchons tous, et demain
L'Internationale
Sera le genre humain.*

So the protesting millions, the grimly earnest soldiers of social revolution, have sung in all the tongues of civilization.

No one who knows anything of the great Socialist movement can doubt for a moment that in this passionate faith in international solidarity, in the oneness of all peoples, there is a great spiritual quality, a visioning of the universal brotherhood of man. For the revolting proletariat seeks freedom, not as a step to the mastery of others: its aim is the destruction of all rule of class by class—freedom for all mankind.

SOCIALISM AND INTERNATIONALISM

The spiritual quality of this proletarian internationalism differentiates it from the mechanical economic internationalism of commerce and finance, and from the intellectual internationalism of science and learning. Unlike these, it has the sacrificial spirit and passion which are essentially religious and which inspire martyrs. For this reason men have respected and honored the Socialist movement for its internationalism, even while opposing it on account of its economic and philosophical teachings and its social programs. That is probably why, in those fateful days and hours of the summer of 1914, the world rested its faith in the sincerity and integrity of the Socialists and believed that they would somehow avert the dread catastrophe of war. It was not to organized Christianity, the religion of the Prince of Peace, that the hope of the world for peace was turned, but—suggestive irony!—to the “irreligious” Socialist movement.

The outbreak of the war revealed the fact that proletarian internationalism was a frail wand, not the sturdy staff we had believed it to be. Once again it was shown that a great movement had been inspired by a shibboleth which it had never closely scrutinized. The watchwords of internationalism have

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

been of incalculable service to the Socialist movement. To declare one's belief in internationalism gives one a sense of exaltation, a feeling of the imminence of the Kingdom of Human Brotherhood. But when the war came it was apparent that the shibboleths of internationalism so fervently chanted for two generations had lacked intellectual significance because they had never been precisely defined.

Amid the agony of the war and the bitter humiliation of failure the Socialists in all lands are now engaged in the task of defining the old terms. They have discovered that two may say the same words, but have meanings as far apart as the poles. To the non-Socialist the controversies which have arisen within the ranks of the Socialists upon this matter of definition appear as manifestations of the ancient struggle between instinct and reason—instinct leading outward to the vision of world-brotherhood, reason holding down to the national need. That there is this conflict between spiritual romanticism and the prosaic realism of life it were idle to deny. That is the experience of every great movement as it is the experience of every sincere and thoughtful mind. How few there are among us who have

SOCIALISM AND INTERNATIONALISM

missed the despair that comes from trying to keep our feet upon the mud and clay of earth the while we hitch our wagons to far-off stars!

II

For some Socialists internationalism is a synonym for anti-nationalism. They adopt the view of that sinister figure, Michael Bakunin, that "the social question . . . can only be satisfactorily solved by the abolition of frontiers." They reject not merely the baser patriotism whose motto is, "My country, right or wrong," but that natural love of country which has none of the elements of chauvinism and is compatible with an intense love for all mankind. They declare that the internationalist can recognize no special obligation to a particular country; that the true Socialist must be "a citizen of the world." Some go so far as to say that the working-people can have no rational choice between despotic and democratic governments so long as the present system of capitalism prevails.

This is the doctrine of Anarchism. It is not consistent with the Socialist philosophy. That it should be accepted by many who call themselves Socialists is only another il-

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

illustration of the manner in which the clear stream of Socialist thought is muddled by the infusion of Anarchist and Syndicalist elements. The very nature of the Socialist philosophy requires the preservation of national unities, a fact which has guided the international policies of the movement from the founding of the first International.

A radical clergyman in New York city, obsessed after the manner of his profession by a passion for symbolism, places all the flags of civilized nations in an iron-pot over a fire and "melts" them. He then pretends to draw from the pot a red flag, symbolical of international Socialism, and unfurls it to the breeze amid the cheers and plaudits of his hypnotized followers. This much-exploited ceremonial was intended to symbolize the passing of nations and their replacement by a world organization undisturbed by the lingual and cultural distinctions which divide the world into national groups. This is not anti-national, perhaps, as much as it is a-national, the negation of nationalism. It is certain that this is the gospel which inspires many Socialists to-day. Its acceptance, however, necessarily involves the abandonment of the distinctive policies of historic Socialism.

SOCIALISM AND INTERNATIONALISM

The name and authority of Marx—*Pontifex Maximus*—are invoked in support of these views so alien to the spirit and history of Socialism. The fact is that Marx in his youth proclaimed views which are essentially at one with those of Bakunin, already quoted. Thus, in the famous *Communist Manifesto* we find the idea that “the working-classes have no fatherland.” Marx argued with force that the development of international industry and commerce tends ever to bring about identity of industrial processes and, consequently, of “uniformity in modes of life.” This, he prophesied, would lead inevitably to the disappearance of national peculiarities and contrasts, of national feeling and patriotism. This prophecy has its hold upon many Socialist minds to-day, notwithstanding the fact that Marx later advocated policies which implied the abandonment of his youthful generalization. The appeal of systems of international speech like Volapük and Esperanto to a certain type of Socialist mind depends for its strength upon the desire to accelerate the coming of the sort of internationalism we have been discussing.

As a matter of dull-drab fact, the romantic generalization of Marx has not been ful-

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

filled. National consciousness has persisted and even flourished. The Frenchman is as much a Frenchman to-day as was his grand-sire of the Napoleonic era. The Briton remains as truly a Briton as any of his ancestors. Capitalism has indeed developed an internationalism, rudely interrupted by the war, but it is not the kind of internationalism which extinguishes national feeling. And there is an internationalism of labor. For the moment we are engulfed in a wave of reaction: blind hatred rules the hearts of millions. But the most significant fact in the world of international politics before the outbreak of the war was the growing solidarity of the working-classes in all lands. But this international solidarity of labor does not eliminate national consciousness, that natural patriotism which inspires each man with a special attachment for the land of his birth and for its institutions and traditions. It has come to be the belief of the responsible leaders of Socialist thought in all lands that national feeling will not disappear; that it is, indeed, a very precious thing. The best of civilization has its roots in nationality. "The Socialist who cannot be a good patriot cannot be a good internationalist. I tell American Socialists

SOCIALISM AND INTERNATIONALISM

clearly and emphatically that a man can simultaneously be both a good Socialist and a good American," stoutly declared M. Cammille Huysmans, the able secretary of the International Socialist Bureau, during the much-discussed Stockholm Conference.

In his maturity Marx recognized the fact that nationality is an enduring thing, and not in itself an evil. He was twenty-nine years old when he wrote the *Communist Manifesto*; forty-four when the International Workingmen's Association was formed. That his thought upon the subject had undergone a great change in the fifteen years intervening is evident from the policies which, under Marx's guidance, the International adopted. It was one of the cardinal features of its policy to defend the rights of peoples struggling for national independence, as, for example, the Poles. And from that time onward it has been an unquestioned policy of the movement to champion the cause of oppressed nationalities, and to oppose every movement looking toward the subjugation of peoples. The Socialist International has championed the cause of the Irish, the Finns, the Poles, the Armenians, the Bohemians, the Hindus, and all other peoples struggling for national independence and free-

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

dom. This policy it could not have taken with sincerity and honor if it had regarded nationality as an evil thing and believed its extinction desirable.

Internationalism is not a synonym for a hatred of nationalism. Rather internationalism presupposes nationalism. It is the interrelation of free and independent nations, their union by fraternal ties. The life of individual nations is a precious thing to be preserved. Just as the individuality of the separate human beings comprising society must be preserved if we are to have a great and a worthy social state, so the life of individual nations must be preserved if we are to have a great and worthy internationalism. As M. Georges Renard, one of the clearest of Socialist thinkers, has said: "The end which Socialists are seeking to attain is not the disappearance of national unities; it is the grouping of nations in great peaceful federations, which shall gradually draw closer so as to embrace the whole civilized world; it is the gradual elaboration of international laws which shall organize humanity, as state laws have organized nations. But that great structure which we wish to build—vast enough to contain the whole human race—will have nations as its

SOCIALISM AND INTERNATIONALISM

pillars; it will rest upon their strong foundations, which have been cemented by the labors of ages, and whose destruction would bring about its own ruin."

This conception of internationalism, fundamental, let me repeat, to Socialism, cannot be abandoned without sacrificing the very soul of Socialism. If the dreamy visionaries whose hostility to individual nations is as marked as their hostility to the capitalist system are permitted to gain their ends, and to determine the future policy of the Socialist movement, their triumph will mean the ignominious end of historic Socialism. It cannot be too strongly emphasized that the Socialism of Marx must rest upon the ever-growing union of free and fraternal nations, not upon the suppression or "benevolent assimilation" of small nations by larger ones. Many an earnest Socialist has fallen into error of reasoning by analogy: if it is well that small business units should be crushed or absorbed by bigger ones, in order that there may be greater efficiency and less friction in the industrial world, why would not the absorption of small states by big ones, and the elimination of innumerable causes of friction which would result, be a good thing? With this philosophy more than

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

one ardent Socialist has condoned the rape and spoliation of Belgium. At the time of the South African War a number of English Fabians argued in the same way that Socialists should welcome imperialism as a form of internationalism, since it was opposed to the separatism of small nations.

According to the principles which we have thus outlined, the invasion of Belgium was an assault upon the foundations of internationalism. No Socialists could support their government in its attack upon the integrity and independence of a friendly neighbor state without being disloyal to proletarian internationalism. And the Belgian worker fighting to defend his fatherland and to repel the invader was fighting the cause of internationalism. In truth, the cause of his fatherland and that of internationalism were one and indivisible. For there is a patriotism that is coincident with the highest internationalism. The patriotism that is braggart and chauvinistic and narrow leads away from internationalism to imperialism and war. But the patriotism that is brave and generous and noble leads away from imperialism and war to fraternalism and peace.

SOCIALISM AND INTERNATIONALISM

III

What, then, must be the relation of the Socialist internationalist to the nation of which he is a citizen? In times of peace this is not a very difficult question to answer. To use whatever powers are available to bring the nation to the acceptance of Socialism and to conduct its international relations with justice and friendship to all nations is the obvious duty of the Socialist. It is in times of war that the answer to the question becomes difficult and perplexing. At several international congresses before the outbreak of the present world war the Socialists of the world tried to lay down some principle or set of principles by which the different Socialist parties might be guided in times of war and threatened war. This subject was last discussed at the Copenhagen Congress in 1910, when it was referred to the next congress, to be held at Vienna in 1914. The war made the holding of that gathering an impossibility. Events moved with such cyclonic rapidity in the summer of 1914 that the attempt to hold the congress at an earlier date and at some other place than Vienna utterly failed. Had it succeeded, the whole course

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

of events might have been materially changed.

At the Stuttgart Congress, in 1907, there was a memorable debate in which the principal participants were August Bebel, the great leader of the German Social Democracy, Jean Jaurès, the eloquent apostle of French Socialism, and Emile Vandervelde, president of the International Socialist Bureau, now Belgian Minister of State. Jaurès proposed a radical policy: In the event of a war crisis arising, the workers must take action to prevent the war by means of public agitation, the general strike, and insurrection. This course energetically pursued in the belligerent countries would, Jaurès argued, effectually prevent war. Bebel would not countenance this policy. He supported a resolution which declared, in substance, that capitalism is the cause of war, and Socialism the only remedy, and advocated the avoidance of military service and refusal to vote any money for the support of armies, navies, or colonies. When Jaurès demanded to know specifically what course the German Socialists would adopt in the event of war being threatened between France and Germany, Bebel made no response. There is much food for thought in the impas-

SOCIALISM AND INTERNATIONALISM

sioned questioning of the great French orator:

“If a government does not go into the field directly against Social Democracy, but, frightened by the growth of Socialism, seeks to make a diversion abroad, if a war arises in this way between France and Germany, would it be allowable in that case that the French and German working-class should murder one another for the benefit of the capitalists, and at their demand, without making the extreme use of its strength? If we did not try to do this we should be dishonored.”

Vandervelde begged the Germans to answer the question of Jaurès, pointing out that by their refusal to do so they were practically destroying all hope of international proletarian action for the prevention of war, and forcing the Socialists of other countries to be reconciled to militarism. “The majority of the congress finds that it would be an evil thing if the French plunge into an anti-military agitation, while the Germans oppose it as much as they possibly can,” said Vandervelde, with pointed candor.

Bebel took the position he had taken earlier at the German Party Congress at Essen, that Socialists could never support a war of

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

aggression, but should always support wars waged in defense of their fatherland. This position Kautsky, the great theoretician, opposed with vigor. He argued against the position of Bebel that to adopt the principle that Socialists must defend their fatherland and support their governments in wars of defense, opposing them only in waging wars of aggression, would be a surrender to the capitalist class. It is not always possible to tell with certainty which power is the aggressor, and it will always be easy for the government of a country to persuade its citizens that its policy is purely defensive. To this Bebel replied that such deception of the workers was possible in the eighteenth-seventies, but not to-day. Kautsky argued further against Bebel that in certain circumstances Socialists might welcome an attack upon their country because it weakened their government. "If, for example, Japan had attacked Russia, were the Russian Socialists obliged to defend their nationality, to support the government? Certainly not."¹

What, then, is the principle by which Socialists should be governed in times of war? Kautsky answered that question by saying

¹ The reader will bear in mind that this refers to the Russia of the period—1907.

SOCIALISM AND INTERNATIONALISM

that, because the workers' interests are never opposed to the interests of other nations, the Socialists should determine their policies not by the criterion of defensive war, but by that of proletarian interests which at the same time are international interests. According to this view, in the event of war arising Socialists must ask themselves, "What is best calculated to advance proletarian interests?" and shape their policies in accordance with the answer.

Soon after the outbreak of the present war Kautsky abandoned the criterion of proletarian interest as being quite as unreliable as that of the differentiation between aggressive and defensive war. Experience has shown that French and German Socialists accepting the principle in good faith arrive at opposing conclusions. The French Socialists identify the victory of France with the interests of the proletariat, while the German Socialists identify the victory of Germany with the interests of the proletariat.

Is there, then, no principle upon which a clear and binding policy, valid for the Socialists of all countries, can be based? To this question Kautsky makes affirmative reply:

"One may dispute who is the attacker

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

and who is the attacked, or which threatens Europe more—a victory of Germany over France or a victory of Russia over Germany; one thing is clear: every people, and the proletariat of every people, has a pressing interest in this; to prevent the enemy of the country from coming over the frontier, as it is in this way that the terror and devastation of war reach their most frightful form, that of a hostile invasion. And in every national state the proletariat must use all its energy to see that the independence and integrity of the national territory are maintained. That is an essential part of democracy, and democracy is a necessary basis for the struggle and victory of the proletariat.”

According to this view, the sole aim of the Socialists must be the protection of their country from the enemy, not the punishment of the enemy or his humiliation. Although he does not say so, presumably Kautsky would protect only the actual territory of a nation, not its ships at sea, for example, though these are, alike in law and logic, part of the national domain, and attacks upon them may be a very serious form of “invasion,” menacing the very existence of a people.

SOCIALISM AND INTERNATIONALISM

The Stuttgart Congress decided upon the following policy: If ever war threatens, the Socialists in the countries affected must take all possible steps to make the outbreak of war impossible. If, despite their efforts, war actually breaks out, they must strive to bring it to an early conclusion and use all the opportunities offered by the economic and political crises produced by the war to further the Socialist program. This resolution was reaffirmed at the Copenhagen Congress in 1910.

IV

This was the status of Socialist opinion and policy upon this question when the First Balkan War brought the Socialists of the leading European countries face to face with the grave peril of a general European conflagration. That a war in the Balkans would be exceedingly likely to embroil the whole of Europe had long been recognized, not only by Socialists, but by all thoughtful students of international politics. A special and extraordinary congress was held at Basel, Switzerland, in November, 1912, to consider what the various Socialist parties must do. This was the last important International Socialist Congress prior to the

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

fateful events of 1914. Unlike previous congresses, which had been able to confine themselves to statements of general principles, the gathering at Basel had to deal with the reality of war. It was confronted by an actual condition, not a theory. Its declarations are, therefore, of cardinal importance.

In addition to confirming the Stuttgart resolution already referred to, the Basel Congress emphasized the threat of actual revolution as an effective weapon in the hands of the Socialists in their efforts to prevent war: "The fear of the ruling classes that a revolution of the workers would follow the declaration of a European war has proved an essential guarantee of peace. The Congress therefore asks all Socialist parties to continue their efforts with all means that appear to them efficacious." The warning to the European governments is plain: "Governments must not forget that, in the present frame of mind of the workers, war will not be without disaster for themselves. They must remember that the Franco-German War resulted in the revolutionary movement of the Commune; that the Russo-Japanese War put into motion the revolutionary movement in Russia, and that the competition in armaments in Eng-

SOCIALISM AND INTERNATIONALISM

land and on the Continent has increased class conflicts and led to great strikes. It would be madness if the governments did not comprehend that the mere notion of a European war will call forth resentment and fierce protest from the workers who consider it a crime to shoot one another down in the interest and for the profit of capitalism, or for the sake of dynastic ambition and of secret diplomatic treaties." The caution of this statement and its lack of revolutionary fire indicate a state of mind little likely to adopt heroic measures.

In the midst of a war affecting the independence of the various Balkan nations, and likely to lead to a general European war, the Basel Congress took the historic position of international Socialism, that the independence and integrity of nations are an essential condition of internationalism. It affirmed the right of each of the Balkan nations to full autonomy. It urged the Socialists of the Balkans to struggle for the establishment of a democratic federation of the Balkan states as the only possible basis for their peaceful development. The Congress clearly recognized that the people of the Balkan states might be called upon to defend themselves against powerful aggressive nations,

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

and that it would then be the duty of the Balkan Socialists to assist in that defense. The Congress laid upon the Socialists of the Balkans the duty of promoting fraternal good-will among the workers of Serbia, Bulgaria, Rumania, Greece, Turkey, and Albania, and to vigorously oppose all attempts to deprive any state of any of its rights.

The program which the Congress set before the Socialists of Austria-Hungary is comprehensive and far-reaching: Not only must they especially oppose all attacks by Austria upon Serbia, but they must work for the liberation from Austrian rule of the various subject Slav nations. They must co-operate with the Socialists of Italy to protect Albania and secure her autonomy. In the opinion of the Basel Congress internationalism not only requires the freedom and independence of all peoples, but it imposes an obligation upon all Socialists to make the liberation of suppressed nations their concern:

The Socialists of Austria-Hungary, Croatia, Slavonia, Bosnia, and Herzegovina must continue with all their strength their successful efforts to prevent any attack of the Austrian monarchy upon Serbia. They must *continue to resist in the future, as they have done in the past, any attempt to take by force from Serbia*

SOCIALISM AND INTERNATIONALISM

the fruits of war or to transform that country into an Austrian province, and thereby to embroil the peoples of Austria-Hungary and other nations of Europe in conflict in the interests of the ruling dynasty. The Social Democratic parties of Austria-Hungary will also have to struggle in the future to secure democratic autonomy for all the southern Slav nations within the frontiers of Austria-Hungary and at present governed by the Hapsburg dynasty. The Socialists of both Austria-Hungary and of Italy will have to give special attention to the Albanian question. The Congress admits the right of the Albanians to autonomy, but recognizes the danger that, under the guise of autonomy, Albania might become the victim of Austro-Hungarian and Italian ambitions. This would not only constitute a danger for Albania herself, but might in the near future threaten the peace between Austria-Hungary and Italy. Albania can only become really independent as an autonomous unit in a democratic federation of the Balkan states. Therefore, the Congress calls upon the Austro-Hungarian and Italian Socialists to combat any action of their respective governments which aims at drawing Albania within the sphere of their influence and to persevere in their efforts to consolidate the peaceful relations between Austria-Hungary and Italy.

The duty of the Socialists of other countries was clearly set forth: In the event of any war-like policy being undertaken by the Russian government, whether by attacks on Constantinople or Armenia, even for the avowed purpose of protecting the Bal-

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

kan nations, the Socialists of Russia, as well as those of Russian Poland and Finland, must immediately inaugurate a revolutionary fight against Czarism to bring about its downfall. The Socialists of Germany, France, and Great Britain must demand that their governments abstain from intervention in the Balkan trouble and refuse all support to either Austria or Russia. The workers of Germany and France must recognize no secret treaties making it necessary for their governments to interfere in the Balkan conflict. The Congress expressed the opinion that "the greatest danger to European peace is the artificially fostered animosity between Great Britain and Germany," and directed the Socialists of those countries to work for an understanding between the two nations upon the limitation of naval increases and the abolition of the right of capture of private property at sea.

v

The declarations of the Basel Congress seemed to provide an adequate and satisfactory policy of internationalism for the guidance of the Socialist parties of the world. In place of the hortative generalizations of

SOCIALISM AND INTERNATIONALISM

earlier declarations there was now a comprehensive program of specific measures. Throughout it was emphasized that internationalism rests upon nationalism; that the maintenance of the independence and integrity of nationalities is essential to the realization of internationalism. Within less than two years Europe was plunged into the greatest war in all human history, and the international solidarity of the Socialist movement was broken and destroyed.

Supported and inspired by Germany, Austria-Hungary rejected all offers of mediation and arbitration. The Socialists of Austria at once fastened upon their government responsibility for the war. The German-speaking parliamentary representatives of the Austrian Social Democratic Party declared: "We are convinced that the Serbian government would not have been able to offer any opposition to those demands of Austria-Hungary which are sanctioned by international law, and would, in fact, have offered none. We are convinced that all that Austria-Hungary asks could have been obtained, and can still be obtained, by peaceful methods." The German Socialists on the eve of war placed the blame at the door of Austria-Hungary. The proclama-

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

tion of the party, issued on July 25th, declared that the war fury was "unchained by Austrian imperialism." While condemning the behavior of the Greater Serbia Nationalists, the proclamation especially condemned "the frivolous war-provocation of the Austro-Hungarian government," whose demands were characterized as "more brutal than have ever been put to an independent state in the world's history, *and can only be intended deliberately to provoke war.*"

Notwithstanding their appreciation of the guilt of their governments, the majority of the Socialists in the Central Empires decided to support their governments, once war was declared. In Austria-Hungary the Socialists took the position that they were justified in this policy by reason of the Russian peril, and that it was for them a defensive war. They were opposed only to Serbia and Russia; they were not directly in conflict with the democratic nations of western Europe. Moreover, they were not called upon, as the Germans were in the case of Belgium, to support the invasion of any neutral nation. For these reasons the conduct of the Socialists of Austria-Hungary has been more indulgently regarded than has that of their German comrades who sup-

SOCIALISM AND INTERNATIONALISM

ported their government against France and England, and in spite of the outrageous crime against Belgium.

The position of the Belgian Socialists needs no explanation or defense. To have refused support to their government in its efforts to repel the invader would have been a base betrayal of all that Socialist internationalism has represented in the world.

But what of France? How came the Socialists of all sects and factions to unite in supporting the Republic in its alliance with Russia? The Basel Congress had enjoined upon the Socialists of France the duty of repudiating the alliance with Russia, and Jaurès and other French Socialist leaders had denounced that alliance in unmeasured terms. The Congress had likewise laid upon the Socialists of France the duty of using their power to prevent their government from supporting Russia, just as it had declared it to be the duty of the German Socialists to prevent their government from giving support to Austria. Yet in the decisive hour all sections of the French Socialist movement united in support of their government and in defense of the Republic.

Under the magnificent leadership of Jaurès the French Socialists loyally observed the

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

rules laid down for their guidance by the Basel Congress. They brought pressure to bear upon their government to withdraw from the alliance with Russia if (a) Russia did not consent to mediation and arbitration, or (b) if she took the initiative in declaring war. There is ample evidence that the French government honestly and bravely acted in accordance with these principles. On the 30th of July, at the great peace demonstration in Brussels, Jaurès announced with deep conviction: "The French government is the best peace ally of that admirable government of England, which took the initiative toward mediation. And it is influencing Russia by its counsels of wisdom and patience." A few hours before his death at the hands of a cowardly assassin Jaurès had an interview with the highest officials of the French government, and received convincing assurances of the sincerity with which the course suggested by the Socialists was being followed. The act of the government in ordering the withdrawal of the French troops ten kilometers from the frontier was an indubitable pledge of its good faith. Germany declared war upon Russia and France and rejected all attempts at mediation. She also attempted

SOCIALISM AND INTERNATIONALISM

to induce Belgium against her will to lend her assistance to an attack upon France, yet it was apparent that the German Social Democrats would not make any effective resistance to the action of their government. Under such conditions the French Socialists must either give up all idea of defending their country, and so abandon the very basis of internationalism, or they must accept as a temporary necessity of the war the alliance with Russia.

As soon as the war broke out the Socialists of Italy began a vigorous agitation demanding that the country remain out of the war, and that the alliance with Germany and Austria-Hungary be repudiated. Sincere in their advocacy of neutrality, they were not by any means neutral in their feelings. Their sympathies were all on the side of the Entente Allies. At the end of July, 1914, the Socialists served notice upon Premier Salandra that any attempt to lead Italy into the war on the side of Austria would be met by revolution: "We can assure you that if Italy mobilizes her army and commands it to march to the direct or indirect support of the Germans against France, that very day there will be no need of any effort on our part to make the Italian people revolt."

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

While from the first the Socialists of Italy sympathized with the cause of the Entente Allies and wished for the defeat of the Central Empires, they strove hard to keep their nation out of the war. While some of the most distinguished leaders of the movement favored the entrance of the nation into the war on the side of the Entente, the party stood for neutrality. Soon after the war began the German and Austrian Social Democrats sent a mission to Italy, ostensibly to explain their attitude, but in reality to influence the Socialists of Italy in favor of the Triple Alliance.

The Italian Socialist Party issued a statement which was a scathing denunciation of Germany and Austria and of the German Socialists. It described the mission as "an offense against the dignity and independence of Italian Socialism," and declared that by its support of the German and Austrian policy of aggression the German Social Democratic Party "forfeited the right to the title of international Socialists." The statement proceeds: "We express our desire that this infamous war may be concluded by the defeat of those who have provoked it—the Austrian and German Empires. For the Empires of Austria and Germany form

SOCIALISM AND INTERNATIONALISM

the rampart of European reaction, even more than Russia. . . . If the German and Austrian Empires emerge victorious from the war, it will mean the triumph of military absolutism in its most brutal expression. . . . In this war is outlined on one side the defense of European reaction, on the other the defense of all revolutions, past and future. . . . And because of this we must affirm that there remains for us only one way of being internationalists—namely, to declare ourselves loyally in favor of whoever fights the empires of reaction, just as the Italian Socialists residing in Paris have understood that one way only remains to be anti-militarist—to arm and fight against the empires of militarism. . . . This is our answer as Italian Socialists to the German Socialists.”

It will readily be understood why the opposition which the Italian Socialists offered to the proposed entry of their nation into the war on the side of the Entente Allies, in May, 1915, while undoubtedly sincere, was not characterized by the vigor and intensity with which they had in the previous year opposed the entrance of their nation into the war as a member of the Triple Alliance. The party has been seriously split on ac-

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

count of the differences which have manifested themselves upon the question of war policy.

It is difficult to make a satisfactory brief summary of the position of the Socialists of Great Britain, owing to the divisions of the movement in that country. The oldest organization, the orthodox Marxist British Socialist Party, with all other sections of the movement, opposed entering into the war. When the British government declared war on August 5th, the day following the invasion of Belgium, the British Socialist Party took the position that the fundamental principles of internationalism were being defended by the government, and that the duty of Socialists to support it was clear. The Fabian Society soon came to the same conclusion, as did the Labor Party, the political organization of the trade unions. The Independent Labor Party, popularly known as "The I. L. P.," the Socialist wing of the Labor Party, continued to oppose the war with great bitterness. It has conducted a vigorous pacifist campaign, taking the position that England was not justified in entering the war. The British Socialist Party and the Labor Party have assisted in recruiting, but have not refrained from criti-

SOCIALISM AND INTERNATIONALISM

cizing the government for its failures in matters of social policy.

VI

With the exception of small and relatively unimportant groups, all the Socialist parties of the world, including those of the Central Empires, have based their policies upon the conception of internationalism as the friendly interrelation and union for the common good of free and autonomous nations. Even the extreme "patriots" among the German Socialists who have defended the invasion of Belgium have only attempted to justify it on the score of that necessity which knows no law. At the opposite extreme, the English Independent Labor Party has never taken the position that armed defense of the nation's right to exist would be wrong; that the working-class has no interest in the preservation of the national independence. It remained for the Socialist movement in America to adopt a position so far at variance with the historic Socialist position.

The Socialist Party of America is the most cosmopolitan of Socialist parties, as this is the most cosmopolitan of nations. Inevitably, therefore, the war gave rise to many

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

controversies within the party. In the circumstances it might have been reasonably expected to keep to the old international ideals, and it is probable that it would have done so but for the preponderance in its membership of national groups whose sympathies were naturally with the Central Empires, as in the case of those of German and Austrian birth or parentage, or opposed to those of the Entente powers, as in the case of the Russian Jews and the Poles bitterly hostile to Russia, and the Irish equally hostile to England. Largely, perhaps by reason of the domination of the movement in this country by German influences, it has never appealed with any great degree of success to French, Belgian, Spanish, or Italian workers. The small representation of these nationalities in the party membership probably accounts for the fact that the policy adopted by the party has, almost from the beginning, coincided in a remarkable manner with the interests of Germany.

Germany protested against our insistence upon our indisputable right to sell munitions to belligerents. Her demand, in the name of "humanity," that we place an embargo on munitions of war was in reality a demand that we revise international law in her in-

SOCIALISM AND INTERNATIONALISM

terest. Such a revision of international law would admirably serve to enslave the world to militarism, for it would place the world in subjection to the nation best equipped with arsenals. It was, in a word, a demand entirely inconsistent with a policy of true internationalism, yet it was urged by the Socialist Party of America as energetically as by the German Foreign Office. At the very time the German ambassador was urging that the government of the United States warn its citizens to keep off ocean-going steamships the Socialist Party was making an identical demand, and it offered the excuses of Potsdam for the *Lusitania* outrage as well as for the invasion and spoliation of Belgium. For the ruthless violation of those limitations upon warfare and militarism which constitute such an important part of the fabric of internationalism, such as the protection of hospital ships, the immunity of non-combatants at sea, and so forth, Potsdam and American Socialism offered the same vain excuses and explanations. Never once was there any condemnation of Germany's conduct. Even the deportation into slavery of the worst kind of many thousands of Belgian workers called forth no protest. When President Wilson

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

was urging Germany to respect the rights of all neutral nations, the official party organ, in big black head-lines, called him "The Maniac in the White House."

It was quite proper that the party should oppose our entrance into the war. That was a legitimate exercise of the prerogatives of citizenship. But Socialist opposition to participation in the war by this nation did not need to be cast on the same model as the propaganda of the German secret service, and to adopt the excuses and sophistries of German diplomats and statesmen.

Following the declaration by Congress that a state of war existed between this nation and Germany, the Socialist Party, at an emergency convention attended by some two hundred delegates, adopted a resolution which cannot be regarded other than as a repudiation of Socialist internationalism and the adoption of anarchist a-nationalism. Ignoring the assaults of Germany upon the fundamental rights of this nation, it proclaimed our declaration of war to be "a crime against the people of the United States and against the nations of the world." It placed our entrance into the war on a lower scale than Austria's war upon Serbia or Germany's upon Belgium: "In all modern

SOCIALISM AND INTERNATIONALISM

history there has been no war more unjustifiable than the war in which we are about to engage." It declared that no single government was to blame for the war, and that the war was "not the concern of the workers." It made no distinction between the Belgian workers fighting to repel an invading foe and the German workers fighting to subdue a neutral and friendly nation. Utterly disregarding the great moral issues involved, which are of fundamental importance to any true internationalism, it called upon "the workers of all countries to refuse support to their governments in their wars," the Belgian as well as the German! It warned the workers "against the snare and delusion of so-called defensive warfare," and declared that "the only struggle which would justify the workers in taking up arms is the struggle of the working-class of the world to free itself from economic exploitation and political oppression." In other words, only the Social Revolution justifies the workers in taking up arms.

This is the antithesis of historic Socialism. In the circumstances any successful propaganda in this country based upon this doctrine would be worth many army corps to the German military machine. Considered

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

apart from the existing circumstances, simply as a statement of principles which should guide Socialists, the resolution is remarkable for its abandonment of the principles of internationalism which from the days of Marx have guided the movement. It places the Socialists who accept it in direct opposition to all uprisings and wars for national independence. According to this declaration of principles, no people can be justified in arming itself to repel invasion by barbarian hordes. Such a doctrine is subversive of civilization and morality, and no movement based upon it can ever gain the support of the best elements of mankind.

IV

INTERNATIONAL SOCIALISM
AND THE WAR

IV

INTERNATIONAL SOCIALISM AND THE WAR ¹

IN the month of August, 1914, international Socialism was the victim of a great disaster. The great German Social Democratic Party, the strongest Socialist Party in the world in point of numbers and parliamentary representation, was confronted with a tremendous challenge, which was, at the same time, the greatest opportunity that ever presented itself to a popular movement of the masses. The challenge was the bellicose policy of the German Imperial Government. The opportunity was the chance to oppose that policy to the limit of endurance and of sacrifice. Unopposed, or weakly opposed, the policy of the government must lead to war upon a scale frightful to contemplate. Successful opposition to that war

¹ Philadelphia *Public Ledger*, June 10, 1917.

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

policy meant that inevitably the international Socialist movement would be credited with the greatest single victory for progress and civilization in all history.

With expectant, hopeful earnestness the whole civilized world waited to see how the German Socialists would act; to see how they would meet the challenge, what they would do with the splendid opportunity which the grim and stern problems of international politics had brought them. No movement in all human history was ever confronted by such an opportunity. Would the German Socialists meet the challenge bravely and dare nobly, defying the Kaiser and his war lords? Or would they acquiesce to the rule of the Kaiser and his war lords, the brutal bullies of Europe?

As all the world knows, they failed and failed miserably. The great Social Democracy, around which so many legends had gathered, did not meet the acid test. Its leaders chose the path which seemed the easier, though it has indeed proved infinitely the harder. (The Devil's path, easy at the opening, is always the hardest.) They missed the greatest opportunity that has ever offered itself to the Socialists of any land.

The failure of the German Social Demo-

SOCIALISM AND THE WAR

crats to seize the golden opportunity which was theirs brought grief and despair to millions of Socialists in other lands. For many years, more than a generation, the German Social Democratic Party had been idealized and worshiped by the Socialists of this and other countries, and its utter and even contemptible failure in the tragic hour of trial was a severe blow.

To some Socialists it was not a total surprise. Personally, I had not expected anything else. In 1910 I wrote from Germany to my friend and comrade, George D. Heron, telling him that, so far as I could see, the German Socialist movement had lost its soul and that it could never be relied upon to stand any severe test. I said that if there should be danger of war the German Socialists would lack the spiritual integrity to stake their all to avert the dire calamity through heroic sacrifice, and that our reliance must be upon the Socialists of France. I remember that I expressed very similar views, at about the same time, to Robert Hunter, the well-known Socialist writer.

A year later, at the Jena Congress of the party, it was made even more manifest that the German Social Democratic Party had lost its soul in the quest for political strength.

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

At that congress the leaders of the party made it quite clear that they would never sacrifice much, or even risk much, for the prevention of war. They virtually refused to consider any effective means of preventing war by international working-class action. It was then, at the Jena Congress, that the present line of cleavage in the party became manifest. Previously there had been divisions such as that between the orthodox Marxists, like Bebel and Kautsky, on the one hand, and the Revisionists, headed by Bernstein, on the other. But now a totally different cleavage was manifest. Its nature may be inferred from the mere mention of the names of the leaders. On one side the majority led by Scheidemann, on the other side the minority led by Karl Liebknecht—heroic son of heroic sire!—and the redoubtable Rosa Luxemburg. The same line of cleavage has persisted throughout the war. The triumph of Scheidemann and the unwillingness of the Germans to adopt any effective action for the prevention of war nearly broke the heart of Jean Jaurès, the great French Socialist leader.

The action of the German Socialist parliamentary representatives in supporting their government, even in the face of the infamous

SOCIALISM AND THE WAR

and cowardly assault upon Belgium, was a betrayal of the cause of international Socialism by a section of its trusted leaders for which no explanation or apology can ever be adequate. It left the Socialists of France and of Belgium no possible course of action save that of supporting their governments to the limit of their powers. What else could they do, indeed? Could they refuse to give their government support in its defense of the Republic and thus serve the plans and purposes of the brutal Hohenzollern dynasty, in the sacred name of Socialism?

French Socialists supporting their government, or Belgian Socialists loyally supporting their government, belong to a very different category from Scheidemann Socialists supporting their government. The former are still Socialists; they are loyal to the covenant of internationalism. The latter are not Socialists; they have played the rôle of Judas.

In this country the Socialist Party has been rent in twain upon the issue of the righteousness of Socialist support being loyally given to the government of the nation. Those of us who have defended the course which this government has taken are scornfully dubbed "patriot Socialists" and

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

“American Scheidemanns.” But we are not Scheidemanns. The test by which the conduct of Socialists and their attitude toward their governments must be judged is not the simple question of supporting such governments or withholding such support, but the question of whether they are upholding essential Socialist principles. Jules Guesde, the fine old revolutionary Marxian Socialist of France, has from the first supported his government; and Scheidemann, the unctuous opportunist of Germany, has from the first supported his government. But what a world of difference separates the policies of the two men! Guesde supports the government of a great democratic republic in a war against a monarchy that is virtually absolute. Scheidemann supports imperial absolutism against the democratic republic. Guesde supports his government in its attempts to maintain the very soul of internationalism, national independence. Scheidemann defends his government in its every attempt to destroy the entire fabric of internationalism. Guesde upholds the right of nations to live their own lives within the bounds of international law and comity, secure and unmolested. Scheidemann defends the imperial doctrine that might is the only

SOCIALISM AND THE WAR

right and upholds the government responsible for the brutal rape of Belgium, the most foul deed of a thousand years of history.

I support the government of the United States in this great war. My late associates, the majority of the National Executive Committee of the Socialist Party, oppose it. But my policy is not that of Scheidemann; that distinction belongs to those who are opposing the government. For in their opposition to this government they are opposing precisely what Scheidemann is opposing and supporting precisely what he supports. Those of us who say that it is our Socialist duty to assist in crushing the Hohenzollern menace to the freedom and well-being of mankind take that position in the interests of internationalism. For the most obvious fact in the present situation is that the cause of the United States and the cause of internationalism are identical. The cause of Germany and her allies and the cause of internationalism are as far apart as the poles.

The basis of Socialism, as I conceive it, is internationalism. The true Socialist does not subscribe to the doctrine of "My country, right or wrong." Active opposition to the government of one's own country, even in war, may at times be a solemn Socialist duty.

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

When the policy of that government is subversive of every moral principle, when it violates the fundamental rights and liberties of other nations, opposition to that government, to the ultimate sacrifice, perhaps, is a Socialist duty. Such conduct means treason, of course, but the traitor's brand becomes a badge of glorious distinction. Karl Liebknecht in his prison, branded as a traitor, is a glorious figure in sharp contrast to the contemptible "patriot" Scheidemann.

Liebknecht's glory consists in the fact that his treason to his own government was inspired by loyalty to that freedom and internationalism of which his government was the arch enemy. The Socialist cannot serve two masters so different in aim and aspiration as internationalism and Prussian militarism. But change the scene a moment. For Germany substitute America. For Liebknecht substitute an American Socialist. Treason here is different, wholly different. No halo of glory can crown the traitor in this case, for his treason is treason to the cause of mankind. Liebknecht's treason served the cause of human freedom and hindered only the cause of despotism. But treason to America in this struggle would serve the ends of despotism and aid in crushing

SOCIALISM AND THE WAR

freedom and democracy throughout the world.

War is a terrible thing, and they who support war must bear a very solemn responsibility. In the highest and best sense of the word I am a pacifist. So are most Americans. We are a pacific people. Militarism is foreign to us. But, greatly as we love peace, there are prices which we will not pay for it. Peace is sometimes a greater evil than war. The peace that comes from servility, from meek acceptance of the oppressor's yoke, is not moral, but immoral. The thoughtful Socialist does not close his eyes to the teachings of history and to the stern realities of life.

In 1861, when Lincoln decided that the union of the nation must be maintained, even though it meant war, many honest and sincere persons condemned his action. Like our present-day extreme pacifists, they wanted peace at virtually any price. Many of them assailed Lincoln as bitterly as Mr. Wilson is being assailed to-day. It is quite evident now that Lincoln's judgments were on the side of justice and morality and civilization, and that his critics were completely wrong. The victory of the sentimental pacifists of that day would have been a

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

calamity, a disaster to this nation and to civilization generally. The decision of the United States to enter the great war accords with the highest and best interests of all mankind. The victory of the pacifists of this day would set back the hands of the clock of progress and strengthen tyranny throughout the world.

From the outbreak of the war in Europe until now the official attitude of the Socialist Party and the tone of its press have been markedly favorable to Germany and her allies. This will not be seriously questioned by any one who will take the trouble to study the subject with reasonable care. It cannot be successfully controverted.

I would not be misunderstood here. In so far as the party has been pro-German in its attitude, that has not been due to a conscious desire to serve the German cause, but rather to a complex of very different causes, some of which have their roots deep in the origins and history of the party. As I pointed out in my letter of resignation from the party executive, the policy of the party has uniformly coincided with the views and interests of the German Foreign Office. When Germany, through Count von Bernstorff, was demanding that the United States

SOCIALISM AND THE WAR

place an embargo on foodstuffs and munitions of war, the party officially made the same demand. When Germany and Austria demanded that the United States keep her citizens from the ocean, the party made the same demand. The party, alone of the Socialist parties of the world, outside of the Central Empires, kept silent in the face of the shameful deportation of Belgian civilians into slavery. Its official anti-war proclamation repeated, in very similar language, the excuses Germany made to the world for her submarine barbarism.

The records of the party show that proposals to hold an International Socialist Congress for the purpose of bringing about peace received no support until Germany—official Germany—began to talk of peace. Then, as soon as it became quite evident that the German Socialists were desirous that such a step should be taken, proposals for the holding of an international congress were made. I succeeded in preventing the proposition to hold a congress from being made the occasion of another piece of pro-Germanism. I wrote the manifesto which was adopted on the subject, a manifesto which set forth a sound Socialist proposal for a congress which should aim to effect

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

peace upon terms beneficial to the working-people in all lands.

Nothing came of our proposal for some time, during which time the majority leaders of the German Socialists were unremittingly working to bring about a congress. Then came the invitation to the Stockholm Congress. I was willing to vote for the sending of three delegates to that congress upon the one condition that they be instructed to oppose to the full extent of their power any and all attempts to bring about a separate Russian-German peace. I stood alone on the executive committee in making that demand and so withdrew my vote. I would not consent to the American Socialist Party being made a catspaw of German imperialism. When three delegates were elected to Stockholm I made another attempt to prevent that by moving that the delegates be instructed to oppose all proposals and plans for a separate Russian-German peace, and that they insist that the phrase "no indemnities," so much in use, should be frankly defined so as to make it quite clear that it did not preclude satisfactory material compensation to Belgium by Germany, and that upon no other terms should they, in the name of the American Socialist Party, agree

SOCIALISM AND THE WAR

to any program containing the phrase. That motion did not receive a single vote besides my own.

In view of these facts it was something of a relief to read in the papers that, after all, the party would not be represented at Stockholm. Much as I deplore such extensions of arbitrary power at the expense of our democratic rights, I could not feel other than grateful that the party was to be saved from an infamous association. That the three delegates chosen would have lined up with Scheidemann and his followers there is not the faintest doubt in my mind. They would have worked together, bravely and honestly, for a general peace. Of that I am quite certain. But failing in the immediate attainment of that end, they would have aided in the efforts of the Germans to bring about a separate peace. That being the case, and believing that such a result would be a terrible blow to Social Democracy throughout the world, I was glad to read that the Administration had acted as it had done.

It is said that when Premier Ribot announced in the French Parliament that no French delegates would be permitted to attend the Stockholm Congress, brave old Jules Guesde led the cheering. Why? Because

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

that extension of arbitrary power as an incident of the war, which in peace times would have called forth his passionate denunciation, was, in the circumstances, less to be feared than the German movement for peace—a menace not less grave than her original insistence upon war. For Germany seeking peace is as sinister as Germany seeking war. She wants a peace, now that she cannot have a triumph, which will leave the seeds of future wars; a peace which will leave her full armed and ready to fight again at a not far-off future. That is not the peace of democracy or of Socialism. It is not the peace which this great nation will accept. The peace we want, and to secure which we must pledge our all, is the peace which victory of democratic ideals over Prussian ideals will give.

The corrupt and dark and dishonorable methods which Germany uses to make war are well matched by the methods with which she seeks peace. One's gorge rises at the spectacle of German Socialists, acting as agents of the Kaiser, trying to betray their Russian comrades into making a separate peace. What ignoble prostitution of a great cause! What a betrayal of comradeship!

SOCIALISM AND THE WAR

Blinded by the dazzling sunlight of a new and unfamiliar freedom, the Russian giant staggers and is bewildered. No man can say what to-morrow will bring forth in that unhappy land. I venture here the prophecy that if the Provisional Government makes a separate peace with Germany the day is not far distant when the Romanoff dynasty will be restored. The ablest men in the Provisional Government realize this fully.

Here in America the Socialist Party is doomed. The very word has acquired a hateful significance for many thousands of Americans who are Socialists and internationalists, and neither sentimental pacifists nor apologists for German militarism.

Fortunately, there is a new party emerging, a great party of popular freedom, of industrial democracy, which will organize the social idealism and moral earnestness of America for practical achievement. This new party will be American in its ideals. And because it is truly American it will be internationalist. Americanism and internationalism are one and inseparable. The new party will not be cast in a Prussian mold. It will be a party of free men and women, not of intellectual bond slaves. It will permit and encourage freedom of opinion

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

and speech within its own ranks. It will place measures above men or party. In a word, it will be an efficient working instrument for American social idealism, not a sterile, dogmatic sect.

Expressing Socialism in terms of American life and experience, this new party will stand squarely for democratic public ownership and control of the things, processes, and functions which are social in character. It will not cling to formulæ and let the substance of the Socialist hope pass by unnoticed. It will be an earnest expression of the moral vision of America, and will instinctively and consciously relate itself to the moral challenges which inhere in our social and economic life. It will make its appeal not to one class alone, but to all men and women of good-will and social vision. It will be a party of the toilers, not because it sets them apart and panders to them, but because its principles carried into effect must bring their emancipation.

V

THE GERMAN DOMINATION
OF AMERICAN SOCIALISM
AND ITS CONSEQUENCES

V

THE GERMAN DOMINATION OF AMERICAN SOCIALISM AND ITS CONSEQUENCES ¹

I

IT may fairly be claimed, I think, that while the world war has greatly weakened the organized Socialist movement, it has enormously strengthened the cause of Socialism itself. The Socialist parties of the world, which before the war seemed impregnable and invincible, have been strained and shattered. The Socialist International has been ruined as effectually as any of the villages of northern France. That the villages will be rebuilt and the Socialist International reorganized is a safe prophecy. When peace comes there will certainly be a general reorganization of the international

¹ *Metropolitan Magazine*, October, 1917.

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

Socialist movement, and, necessarily, of the national Socialist parties. The old forms, twisted and distorted by the agony and strife of the war, will not serve the needs of the movement.

Of the future one thing may be predicted with certainty: if the Socialist International is restored and international congresses held as in ante-war days, the old German domination of the movement, of its policies and its thinking, will no longer exist. All through the troubled career of the first International—the famous International Workingmen's Association, founded by Marx—the complete domination of the movement by the Germans was the cause of much bitter and angry resentment. The French, the British, and the Russians always resented what they considered to be the arrogant and domineering methods of Marx and his associates. From the first days of the second International to the ill-favored and sinister gathering at Stockholm, in the summer of 1917, the domination of the movement by the Germans has been resented by the Socialists of other lands. It is inconceivable that in the face of their betrayal of the international cause, in 1914, the German Social Democrats will ever again wield in international Social-

GERMAN DOMINATION

ist congresses the power and influence they formerly did.

It is easy to understand the authority and influence of the Germans in the international Socialist movement. Marx, Engels, and Lassalle were all three Germans. The names of this trio stand for the great formative period of modern Socialism. Lassalle laid the foundations of Socialist organization; Marx and Engels formulated its philosophy and classified its tactics. Socialism is inseparably identified with these great names. True, the roots of Socialism were of French rather than German origin. Morelly, Boissel, Barnave, Babeuf, Saint-Simon, and Fourier all preceded Marx, and some of them anticipated much of his teaching. To some of these French Socialists Marx was perhaps more deeply indebted than he himself knew, certainly far more than is generally known. That he was inspired by Saint-Simon is certain, and it is probable that he was indebted to Barnave, an edition of whose works appeared in Paris in 1843, the year in which Marx and his young bride arrived in the French capital. Certainly the student can find in the writings of Barnave a near approach to those great fundamental ideas of Marx—the materialistic concep-

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

tion of history and the doctrine of class struggles.

It is no disparagement of these early French Socialists to say that Marx accomplished the greater task of systematizing the Socialist philosophy and economic theories and formulating the program of action which kindled the imagination of all who revolted against age-long inequality and injustice. With heroic persistence Marx imposed his iron will upon the old International. He brooked no rivals, no questioning of his authority. "Socialism" and "Marxism" came to be synonyms and acceptance of Marx's teachings became a test of Socialist orthodoxy. The supremacy of the Germans in the councils of international Socialism was an inevitable consequence. They were, naturally, the chief Marxian expositors and commentators, frequently overwhelming with their Talmudic lore the Socialist spokesmen of other lands. A sort of Socialist Apostolic Succession was tacitly recognized. Then, too, the Socialist movement of Germany, first to be organized, made more rapid and consistent progress as a political force than did the movement of any other country. This led, naturally enough, to the acquisition by the German Socialists of a commanding

GERMAN DOMINATION

influence in the international councils of the movement. They have assumed their superiority over the Socialists of other lands, and few have called the assumption into question. The Socialists of France and of England have, on the whole, paid least attention to the German leadership. The English have cared little for the abstract theorizing so dear to the German mind, while the French have found less inspiration in the great German writers than in their own. Always in the background of the French movement there has been the same resentment against German domination which was so manifest in the first International.

By none of the national Socialist movements has the domination of the Germans been so meekly and slavishly accepted as by the American movement. There are great historic reasons for this. The utopian Socialism of Owen and Fourier inspired many experiments in this country, of which New Harmony and Brook Farm may be regarded as types. But Socialism as a movement of the proletariat, as the fiercely passionate faith and urge of a class in revolt, was first preached in America by German immigrants. Wilhelm Weitling and Joseph Weydemeyer, friends and associates of Marx, came in 1849,

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

and in the following year Weitling founded a Socialist magazine in the German language. The famous *Communist Manifesto*, written by Marx and published early in 1848, soon reached this side of the Atlantic, and among the German immigrants obtained a great vogue. Weydemeyer was especially active in promulgating the doctrines of Marxian Socialism. From 1850 to the outbreak of the Civil War the Socialist agitation among the German working-men was carried on with great vigor. The war, naturally, paralyzed the movement.

With the rise in 1864 of the International, under the leadership of Marx, European Socialism emerged from the eclipse of a decade and there was a period of intense activity. It was a period of progress in every department of human effort. When the Civil War ended, Socialist agitation in America revived. With a few notable exceptions, the movement was inspired and led by Germans, who heroically strove to make it appear American. Socialism was indelibly stamped as a German importation. From that time onward, for a full generation, the movement in America was dominated by Germans, and its principal organs were printed in the German language. Papers

GERMAN DOMINATION

printed in English obtained few readers and were forced to rely upon the German Socialist working-men of the country for financial support.

When I came to America, early in 1901, and joined in the creation of the present Socialist Party—it was then known as the Social Democratic Party—there was not a branch to which I could belong at which the business was wholly transacted in English! German was the language used in keeping the records, and generally in the transaction of business. Sometimes, in deference to the English-speaking members like myself, parts of the discussions were freely translated into English. While our good German comrades exerted themselves to get English-speaking members, and sincerely welcomed as many of these as came, they were made uncomfortable by our presence in the meetings, and by the need of translating their discussions for our benefit, while we were equally uncomfortable. As a result only those English-speaking members who were specially fond of associating with the Germans, and those who possessed an almost unlimited amount of patience, stayed in the movement for long.

The principal “propaganda literature” dis-

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

tributed among the English-speaking working-men were an English translation of the *Communist Manifesto* of Marx, written in 1847, and some later German pamphlets, also translated into English. These pamphlets might as well have been printed in the original German. They were as unintelligible to the average American working-man as if they had never been translated at all. They were still German in their thought and psychology.

That there should be a closer affinity between the Socialists of America and those of Germany than exists between the Socialists of Germany and those of other countries is the inevitable consequence of these important historic facts. In the Socialist literature of no other country do we find such constant appeal to the authority of German Socialist theorists, or to German party precedents and decisions. In the international congresses the American delegations have generally been little more than mere adjuncts to the German delegations.

If we bear this background of the German origins of the organized American Socialist movement in mind we shall be able to understand its failure to relate itself successfully to American life and needs. We shall

GERMAN DOMINATION

understand why American Socialism has so often spoken with a German accent. We shall be able to understand, too, its attitude in the present war.

II

The Socialist Party is quite unlike any other political party America has ever known. It is based upon a conception of political organization which is foreign to American political methods, traditions, and ideals. It is essentially a product of mid-European conditions and experience. That it has signally failed to achieve its purpose has long been painfully apparent to many of the most experienced workers in the party. The disrepute into which the party has fallen is not a temporary condition, the result of the war. The trouble lies far deeper. It is inherent in the organization of the party. It has long been apparent that while belief in Socialism was steadily advancing and Socialist ideas and ideals were being received with increasing favor, the Socialist Party was making no headway as a political factor in the life of the nation, but rather losing ground and falling deeper into ill repute. Socialism in America is indeed making rapid progress as a political force, but the Socialist

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

Party is not an important factor in that progress. Some fifteen or sixteen years ago certain cities in Massachusetts elected Socialist mayors and other municipal officials. Since that time many American cities have followed suit; but in no instance have these cities seen fit to continue to place their confidence in Socialist administrators. This is quite contrary to the experience of the European Socialist parties, which rarely lose control of cities once won.

The reason for this failure of the Socialist Party is its inability to relate its propaganda and its policies to American life and needs. In particular it has insisted upon a rigid discipline over its members intolerable to a free people. The citizen who joins the Socialist Party must not only vote unquestioningly for every nominee of the party, no matter how keenly he feels the unfitness of a particular candidate and the undesirability of his election; he must go farther and refrain from voting at all in elections where the party has no candidates. John Jones, American citizen, believes in Socialism and desires to use his vote to further the realization of the Socialist program. In a particular election he reaches the conclusion that the candidates of the Socialist Party, with

GERMAN DOMINATION

one exception, are all able and worthy men for whom he can vote with good conscience and the satisfaction of furthering the Socialist cause. The one exception is, let us suppose, the candidate for a judicial office who is in all ways inferior to one of the opposing candidates. Acting according to his conscience as an American citizen and giving his support to the man better fitted for the judicial office, Mr. Jones finds himself under charges as a traitor to the Socialist cause.

Or take the case of the party member who, in an election in which the Socialist Party puts forward no candidates for certain offices, votes for the men among the candidates of other parties who come nearest to representing his ideas. Such a man is judged guilty of party treason. Men have actually resigned from the party in Massachusetts because the party denied them the right to vote in the town meetings—the purest form of democratic government existing! The party has long denied membership to enlisted men, and by its rules any elected official who votes for any military or naval expenditures whatever must be expelled. The one Socialist Congressman, on the occasion of the historic first vote of ap-

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

appropriations for the present war, strongly sympathizing with the Allied cause and unable to vote against the appropriation, was obliged to respond to the roll-call with a shamefaced "Present and not voting." At the last state convention of the party in Massachusetts a motion ordering all members of the party who belonged to unions affiliated with the American Federation of Labor to withdraw or forfeit their membership in the party came within three votes of being adopted. The reason offered for this remarkable resolution, which was proposed by the Lettish Socialists, who have acquired a dominant influence in the party in Massachusetts, was the fact that the unions in the American Federation of Labor are loyal to the American government and the American nation in this crisis!

To keep American Socialism in a strait-jacket of Prussian discipline is impossible. Free men will not identify Socialism with this intellectual and moral despotism. They will not tolerate the rigid discipline which leaves them no freedom of action and which places loyalty to the party, the machine, above loyalty to the actual Socialist program.

GERMAN DOMINATION

III

From the outbreak of the war in Europe the Socialist Party of the United States has presented the strange spectacle of a proletarian movement for industrial democracy reaching conclusions and advocating policies identical with the conclusions and policies of the great militarist autocracies of Central Europe. The party has permanently fastened upon itself the stigma of copperheadism and disloyalty to the fundamental principles of democracy. It has forsaken the internationalism of Marx and Engels, Liebknecht, Bebel, and Jaurès, and become the ally of Prussian militarism. Every claim which the governments of Germany and Austria-Hungary have made in their relations with the government of the United States has been advanced by the Socialist Party or by its responsible spokesmen. The Socialist Party of the United States has advocated as its own the contentions of Potsdam.

A chronological survey of the utterances of the party, its press, and many of its best-known leaders upon the war, and upon the international controversies which have occurred in the past three years, reads like a

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

summary of Germany's diplomatic correspondence with all its insincerities, its shallow excuses, and miserable evasions. Such a survey affords convincing proof of the charge that the party has been notably pro-German in its attitude. This is not the result of the work of German agents with abundant funds, as some have charged. In a few cases there may have been some connection with the German secret service. For example, a prominent Socialist, at one time editor of one of the most important organs of the party, was in the pay of the official or semi-official German propaganda in this country and served that propaganda by writing articles in the Socialist press to create "peace sentiment." Two Socialist advocates of peace came here from abroad, one from Germany and the other from Ireland, and began to agitate for peace. The German advocate used the Socialist press, while the Irish advocate addressed meetings arranged by the Socialist Party all over the country. It has been charged by an influential member of the National Committee of the Socialist Party that both these gentlemen, on arrival in this country, called on Mr. Bernard Dernburg, the personal representative of the Kaiser who was directing the official German

GERMAN DOMINATION

propaganda in this country. I know that efforts were made by German agents to influence the party's candidate for President, Mr. Benson—of course wholly without success. It is quite possible that a few Socialists have been corrupted by the insidious secret service of Germany, but such cases must have been so few as to be quite negligible as a factor in influencing the party's policy. The reasons for the adoption by the party of the principal features of the German imperial policy are deeper and more subtle; they are inherent in the essential structure of American Socialism.

First of all, there is the German domination of the intellectual life of the movement, already accounted for upon the grounds of historical development. This alone would account in large measure for the phenomenon we are seeking to explain. To it must be added the natural and inevitable resentment of the Russian Jews—so influential an element in the party—against the Romanoff dynasty and the old Russian régime in general. Of course, when the war began, and for a long time afterward, the alliance of England and France with Russian despotism was an unpalatable fact which many of the sympathizers with the democratic nations of

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

western Europe found it impossible to reconcile with democratic aspirations and ideals. The attitude of the Russian Jews in the movement was from the first, if not pro-German, at least hostile to the Russian government and, inevitably, to its Allies.

Finally, in addition to the sentimental pacifism which has grown up in the party and to a large extent supplanted historic Socialism, we must take into account the spread among American Socialists of doctrines similar to those which the fanatical Nikolai Lenine and his followers have promulgated in Russia with such disastrous consequences to the new Social Democratic Republic. Leninism is not peculiar to Russia: many of the ablest American Socialists have long been conscious of its menace to the movement in this country and have done their best to stamp it out. That the working-class can have no interest in the maintenance of nations, that war is unjustified even in defense of national freedom and of democratic institutions, and that only for social revolution is the proletariat ever justified in fighting are doctrines which Lenine preached in Russia with such dire results, and they are doctrines which have been officially promulgated by the Socialist Party

GERMAN DOMINATION

of America in the war resolution adopted at its special convention held in St. Louis and later ratified by party referendum.

I was a dissenting member of the committee which prepared that resolution and attended all its sessions. I know that I heard members of the majority of that committee declare again and again that, until capitalism is overthrown, all governments are alike; that the workers have no choice to make as between an autocracy like that of Russia of old and a political democracy such as we have; that even if the country should be invaded the workers could have no interest in repelling the invaders, no matter who they might be. "It is not our country. Why should we defend what is not ours?" was asked more than once and by more than one member of the committee. "We can have nothing to do with nations; we are concerned only with world citizenship, and nations have no significance for us," was the declaration of one member who spoke for a group, the dominant group in the committee. Hours were spent discussing whether such terms as "our country" and "our government" should be used, the contention being that "the working-class has no country and no government."

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

Whatever the explanation may be, the fact stands out that with astonishing uniformity the Socialist Party has taken the same position as the spokesmen for Germany have taken. It has adopted policies which, in so far as they succeeded, must contribute to Germany's success. Never has it taken a position contrary to that taken by Germany; never has it adopted a policy which in so far as it succeeded must contribute to the success of Germany's foes. Having regard to the fact that these statements apply to the policy of three of the most eventful years in history, the suggestion of mere coincidence is obviously outlawed.

How, then, shall we explain the uniform agreement of American Socialist policies with German imperial interests? How comes it that the minds of the leaders of the world's greatest military autocracy and the minds of the leaders of a great proletarian Socialist movement react in the same way and reach the same conclusions with such marked uniformity? Are the aims of the two and their attitude toward life essentially alike? Surely no! There is nothing in common between Socialism and Prussian militarism. What then? Has the leopard of autocracy changed its spots? Has its fight been for So-

GERMAN DOMINATION

cial Democracy and not for militarism, after all? Is that why its policies and its claims have been so unreservedly indorsed in the name of Socialism—were the bloody rape of Belgium, the enslavement of civilian populations, the sinking of the *Lusitania* and of hospital ships full of wounded men and heroic nurses so many tortuous steps toward the splendid goal of Socialism? Shall we not rather conclude that Prussian imperialistic guile has overmatched and tricked the Socialists?

The sober fact is that, as a result of the historical and psychological facts and forces which I have outlined, many of the leading Socialists of America have been unable to think of the war except as Germans think. They have been so long accustomed to accept the judgment of the leaders of German Socialism as infallible, and have so long centered upon the German movement their hope for the realization of the ideals of international Socialism, that in this supreme crisis they have more or less unconsciously followed their German mentors in abandoning the internationalism of historic Socialism. Under their banner they have rallied all the sentimental peace-at-any-price pacifists and non-resistants, German sym-

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

pathizers, Syndicalists, and Sinn Feiners of the type of Larkin and his followers with their intense hatred of England.

The average member of the party has no idea of the extent to which the Socialist Party has through its leaders become identified with the German cause. Single incidents are often significant only when considered in relation to other incidents. Acts which by themselves attract little or no attention assume vital importance when connected with other acts. No one has taken the trouble to compile the evidence of the pro-Germanism of the party leaders, to drive home the irresistible logic of the accumulated facts.

As early as the middle of August, 1914, with the infamous assault upon Belgium still fresh in our minds, when it was evident that if the designs of Prussian imperialism were to be frustrated at all the resources of all the civilized world must be made accessible to the nations opposing her, the party's National Committee on Immediate Action issued a demand that the government of the United States prohibit the exportation to Europe of food, money, and munitions of war. As all the world knows, this was precisely what the Germans wanted our government to do,

GERMAN DOMINATION

and what their leading men were already demanding. Had the government of the United States done anything of the kind it would have been equivalent to presenting Germany with a force superior to England's navy. Germany would have mastered Europe in less than six months, thanks to our assistance, and her vision of a German Empire stretching from the North Sea to the Persian Gulf would have been realized. From time to time the party has reiterated this demand of the German government. In February, 1917, the two members of the National Executive Committee of the party, who were authorized to act as an emergency committee, addressed a demand for an embargo to President Wilson and to many members of Congress. It is worthy of note that one of the two men making that demand was Mr. Victor L. Berger, of Milwaukee, a native of Austria and a strong pro-German, who less than two weeks previously had editorially declared in his paper that "the world war would have been won by Germany two years ago if there had been an embargo on American exports." This, it must be remembered, was immediately after Germany's declaration of unrestricted submarine warfare against the United States

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

and other neutrals. Mr. Berger has from the beginning championed the "Majority Socialists" of Germany who supported their government and bitterly denounced Karl Liebknecht and the "Minority Socialists." Yet Mr. Berger was chosen as an "American" delegate to the Stockholm Conference!

It will be remembered that there was a great "peace demonstration" held in Madison Square Garden under the patronage of the notorious Doctor Dumba, the Austro-Hungarian ambassador, who was later dismissed for his unfriendly and unneutral activities here, and Captain Boy-Ed, the German military attaché, whose presence here was also found to be undesirable. It was well known to every one that the demonstration was part of the propaganda carried on under the auspices of the German government, yet the Socialist Party organization in New York sent a speaker to represent it officially at the demonstration, a speaker against whom the charge of being in the pay of the semi-official propaganda of Germany was freely made.

There was another peace demonstration controlled by the German propaganda which the party leaders regarded with equal favor. A National Peace Congress, which every one

GERMAN DOMINATION

knew to be part of the German propaganda, was held in Chicago, and the National Executive Committee decided to send delegates to it. The delegates were chosen, but a vigorous protest by the *Neue Yorker Volks Zeitung* and Mr. Boudin, of the National Committee (a larger body than the National Executive Committee), caused the delegates to be withdrawn. It was at that infamous congress that the whole gathering rose and cheered the news of the sinking of an American passenger ship by a German submarine, perhaps the most despicable episode in all the dirty and sinister propaganda movement of the German sympathizers in this country.

In May, 1915, the National Committee of the party adopted a "Peace Program" in which it demanded that there be no indemnities and no forcible annexations—principles already put forward by German statesmen who had come to recognize that their aims had been thwarted. In September, 1916, Mr. Morris Hillquit, in a newspaper controversy with the noted Belgians, Senator Henri La Fontaine and Emile Vandervelde, chairman of the International Socialist Bureau, made it quite clear that this demand meant that there should be no payment by Germany of any compensation

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

to Belgium for the great wrongs inflicted upon that country, the destruction of property, the colossal fines and extortions and the spoliation of its civilian population. In May of this year,¹ as a member of the National Executive Committee of the party, I proposed that any delegates sent to the Stockholm Conference should be instructed that we could only subscribe to the formula "no indemnities" if it was clearly defined to provide proper compensation to Belgium. That proposal did not receive the support of any one of the four other members of the committee, two of whom were named as delegates to the Stockholm Conference. Comment upon this is surely quite unnecessary.

So far as I can recall, there is not a sentence or even a word in any of the numerous resolutions or proclamations issued by the party since the war began in which there is any condemnation of Germany's policy. Not a word of sympathy for Belgium or protest against the brutal attack upon her sovereignty, though this was an attack upon the essential basis of internationalism; not a word of protest against the deportation of civilian populations into slavery and worse than slavery, though the victims were of

¹ *I. e.*, 1917.

GERMAN DOMINATION

the great international working-class; not a word of horror at the sinking of passenger ships with their non-combatant passengers, the ruthless torpedoing of hospital-ships full of wounded men and nurses and of relief ships bearing the grain furnished by a compassionate people to feed the innocent civilian victims of Germany's lawless assault upon organized society. Never once has there been a word of appeal to the Socialists of Germany and Austria to use their influence to check such wanton outrages which have no parallel in the history of warfare among civilized peoples. The silence of American Socialism has been as eloquent of its pro-Germanism as its speech. The party leaders have spoken when and how the interests of the autocracies of Central Europe required; they have been silent when those interests required silence.

IV

The consequences of this pro-Germanism must inevitably prove disastrous to the cause of Socialism in America. For the moment the policy has the appearance of success, for the party membership grows despite wholesale resignations. It is not a genuine Socialist growth, however. German

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

sympathizers, Syndicalists, Tolstoyan non-resistants, slackers, and every conceivable type of pacifist now rally to the standard of the Socialist Party because they recognize in it the best available instrument for their purposes. Party organizers of wide experience have assured me that in many cities people who make no pretense of being Socialists are joining the party and using it as a convenient cover for their activities.

When the war is ended and our political life returns to its normal state, the Socialist Party will be confronted by the sorry consequences of its foolish pro-German policy. With its shameful record of faithlessness to the ideals of democratic internationalism, and of allegiance to the great autocracies of the world in their assault upon democracy, the party will wither under the blight of the execration showered upon it by a free people. The Socialist Party can never hope to outlive the shame and infamy its leaders have brought upon it.

As a Socialist and an internationalist loyal to the great and splendid ideals of historic Socialism, I hope to see a new party arise which will redeem the Socialist cause in America. I believe such a party is inevitable. It will be truly American, and there-

GERMAN DOMINATION

fore truly international in its spirit. It will be based upon the realities of American life and not upon mere dogmas. It will express the moral revolt of the great masses of the people of this nation against privilege and plunder and their aspiration for a just and fraternal commonwealth. Unless such a party comes into being Socialism as a political movement can have no future in this country. Evolution will insure the adoption of much of the Socialist program, probably under some other name and through the agency of one of the existing political parties, but there will be no distinct and avowed Socialist movement unless a new party such as I have indicated shall arise.

VI

INFLUENCE OF THE WORLD
WAR UPON SOCIALIST
THEORY AND TACTICS

VI

INFLUENCE OF THE WORLD WAR UPON SOCIALIST THEORY AND TACTICS ¹

I

THAT the world war must profoundly influence the political life and thought of civilized nations is as trite as it is true. Certainly no political movement so universal in its ramifications as Socialism can fail to be influenced by the war and its outcome. So much one may say with absolute certainty. But the forecasting of political developments is an extremely hazardous business, and the wise and experienced student of history and politics will not rashly essay the prophet's rôle. There is, indeed, a definite and somewhat limited sphere within which the probable development of social

¹A Lecture delivered at Columbia University.

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

movements may be forecasted with full scientific sanction and with reasonable certainty. There are observable facts and tendencies which can be noted and measured, so that the student can point to a very definite stream of social tendency. Within the limits thus prescribed we may fairly consider the probable effects of the world war upon Socialism and the international Socialist movement.

To begin with, we need to make a sharp distinction between Socialism and the organized parties of Socialism. Definition and delimitation are sorely needed here. For example, do we mean by Socialism a program of social action or a system of thought? Do we mean by the Socialist movement the strong universal effort toward actual socialization, or do we mean the organized political parties which avow Socialism as their goal? Obviously the movement in the direction of industrial collectivism is not confined to any particular party; men and women of all parties believe in and work for fairly extensive programs of socialization. In order to believe in public ownership of railroads and mines, for example, it is not necessary to accept the theories of Karl Marx, or even to understand them.

INFLUENCE OF THE WORLD WAR

It has come to pass that the word Socialism is a synonym for Marxism—that is to say, for the body of philosophical doctrines and economic theories promulgated by Karl Marx and his immediate disciples. Writers on the subject, whether friendly to Socialism or hostile to it, with common accord have so interpreted the word. This was not always the case. Prior to the ascendancy of Marx and Engels, Socialism was never defined in terms of dogma. The name was applied exclusively to schemes and programs for social reconstruction, never to philosophical systems or abstract economic theories. The Socialist was a man who, starting with a criticism of the existing social order, had conceived the general outline of a new social system and developed a program of action looking toward the realization of the ideal social commonwealth of his visioning. This fairly describes all the great pre-Marxian Socialists. They were utopians, architects of wondrous dream castles. Thus the great French Socialists prior to Marx—Saint-Simon, Fourier, and Cabet—were not concerned with theories of historical development or of abstract economics. They described the evils of competition and sketched with more or less detail the organization of a col-

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

lectivist society. They sought to realize their ideals through various ambitious experiments in social organization.

In this sense Robert Owen, who is credited with being the first to call himself by that name, was a Socialist. Starting out with a rigorous analysis of the evils of competitive capitalist society, he proceeded inevitably to the development of a very concrete and definite picture of a reconstructed social state based upon co-operation. When he or his disciples were asked to explain the meaning of Socialism it never occurred to them to answer in terms of theory and dogma; they invariably replied by giving a glowing picture of the concrete, practical advantages of co-operation. Owen, like Fourier and Cabet, chose the United States as the theater of his most ambitious experiments, and from these adventures in utopia came many an inspiration of lasting value to the nation.

The renaissance of science which marked the middle of the nineteenth century, forever associated with the great names of Darwin and Spencer, had a remarkable influence upon Socialist thinking. Marx was of the school of Darwin and Spencer, and was the first clearly and systematically to connect Socialism with the theory of evolu-

INFLUENCE OF THE WORLD WAR

tion. He conceived Socialism not as a form of social organization to be created at will, but rather as a stage in social evolution to be reached as the result of an inevitable and irresistible process. For the Socialism which took the form of carefully thought out schemes of social organization and programs for their realization he expressed profound contempt. Morelly, Babeuf, Saint-Simon, Fourier, Cabet, and Owen he derided as "utopians." In vain do we search the voluminous writings of Marx for any such concrete plan of a Socialist society as his predecessors created with so much ingenuity. The student who goes to the writings of Marx in order to obtain a definite picture of the Socialist society of the future will be sorely disappointed. Instead he will find elaborate philosophical speculations and generalizations and formidable economic theories.

II

Marxism, though it has come to be regarded as synonymous with Socialism, has in reality no definite and necessary connection with Socialism in the primary and essential meaning of that term. It consists, on the one hand, of a theoretical system, and, on

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

the other hand, of a conception of tactics governing proletarian action. The principal features of theoretical Marxism are, first, a theory of social evolution and, second, a complete system of political economy. The conception of tactics is really derived from the theory of social evolution, and the separation of the two is admittedly an arbitrary classification.

The doctrine of historical materialism, which finds in the material and economic forces the motivation of social progress, is the basis of the Marxian superstructure; but there is nothing in that doctrine which logically and inevitably leads to a belief in the soundness of collectivist principles. On the other hand, belief in collectivism does not logically and inevitably lead back to the acceptance of that theory of historical development. It is quite possible for one to believe in the doctrine of historical materialism without any reservations whatsoever, and still believe that private ownership of railways, for example, is better than public ownership of railways. It is equally possible to believe fully in public ownership while rejecting utterly Marx's great theory. Some of the best-known exponents of that theory are anti-Socialists.

INFLUENCE OF THE WORLD WAR

Even the doctrine of class warfare and its rôle in social evolution, which is part of the theory, can be accepted without leading to the necessary acceptance of the Socialist program of public ownership. With full intellectual integrity one may recognize the fact that class struggles have played an important and even determining rôle in history, and may also recognize the existence of an important class conflict in present society, and yet be an extreme individualist. The theory of class war is quite as consistent with a belief in aristocratic government as it is with belief in democratic government. It does not necessarily lead to a Socialist conception of society. The Anarchist with his extreme individualism relies on the theory of class warfare in his propaganda quite as much as the Socialist does in his propaganda for collectivism. In like manner, the economic theories of Marx, his development of the labor theory of value held by the early English economists, and his theory of surplus value, do not by the sheer force of logic lead to the Socialist goal. It is quite possible to accept the theory of surplus value as a sufficient and scientific explanation of the phenomena of rent, interest, and profit, while believing that an aristocratic govern-

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

ment is better than a democratic government, and that benevolent capitalism is more to be desired than Socialism. On the other hand, many earnest and sincere Socialists, some of them holding eminent positions in the movement, have rejected the theory in its entirety.

We are not here considering the merits of the Marxian synthesis. Personally, I have called myself a Marxian Socialist and believe that the major theories of Marx are sound in the main. As aids to the understanding of existing conditions they are, in my judgment, of inestimable value. But I have always drawn a sharp distinction between the conception of Socialism as a definite reorganization of society on a collective basis and the conception of Socialism as a body of philosophical and economic theories with which the arguments for that reconstruction have been reinforced. To put the Marxian synthesis in the place of Socialism and to make belief in Marx's theories a test of Socialist faith is a very different matter. It is precisely this mistake which many doctrinaire Socialists have made. They have insisted upon rigid tests of orthodoxy. They have regarded Socialism not as a practical goal to be attained, but as a

INFLUENCE OF THE WORLD WAR

body of dogma. They have seemed to believe that when Marx finished his great work the sum of human knowledge and understanding was complete. To reject this view is not to deny the greatness of Marx; indeed, acceptance of the view is only possible to those who fail to comprehend his greatness.

Long before the outbreak of the war in Europe, in August, 1914, there were abundant signs of a widespread revolt in the Socialist ranks against the narrow and sterile intellectualism which substituted belief in the theories of Marx for belief in Socialism itself. Orthodox Marxian formulations were rejected by many very able Socialist leaders. Keir Hardie and MacDonald in England rejected the class-struggle theory even while themselves actually engaged in the class war. Bernstein, Vollmar, David, and others in Germany vigorously challenged every part of the Marxian system of thought, utterly rejecting the principal doctrines of Marx. In France, Jaurès insisted that the major doctrines of Marx must be modified and reinterpreted in the light of modern knowledge; even the elder Liebknecht, a Marxist of the Marxists, was forced to the conclusion that the theory of class war could only be

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

accepted as a result of broadening the meaning of the term "working-class," so expanding it as to include practically the whole membership of society with the exception of a relatively small group of rich landlords and big capitalists. The Revisionist movement headed by Bernstein was essentially a revolt against the substitution of Marxian orthodoxy for Socialist conviction.

One of the most likely influences of the war upon the Socialist movement is the completion of the revolt against doctrinaire Marxism. In the future the questioner who asks, "What is Socialism?" will be answered in terms of definite principles of social reconstruction, not in terms of philosophy or abstract economics. Instead of speculations concerning the origins of the institutions of private property, the family, and the state, the questioner will be met with arguments in favor of public ownership supported by statistical and other information. Instead of academic dissertations upon economic determinism there will be evidence to prove the superiority of public co-operation over competitive capitalism. The Socialist textbook of the future will pay very little attention to the *Communist Manifesto* and *Das Kapital* except as historical references. It

INFLUENCE OF THE WORLD WAR

will pay far more attention to the balance sheets of public industrial enterprises as contrasted with those in private hands, and to emphasizing the important distinction between things, tools, processes, and functions which are individualistic in character and should therefore be subject to private ownership and individual direction, and those which are social in character, and should therefore be subject to public ownership and democratic direction.

Unless all signs fail, this war is destined to emancipate Socialist thinking from doctrinaire Marxism. We are witnessing the close of the Marxian epoch in Socialist history. From this time onward men will concern themselves with clearly defined ideals and programs rather than with philosophies. Socialism will once more become a movement inspired by a definite and comprehensible conception of a new social order rather than a philosophical and sociological synthesis. In the stress and strain of this great war the leading nations of the world have found themselves confronted by the fact that capitalism is inherently and universally inefficient. As the pressure has increased they have been compelled to resort to an ever-increasing socialization of their economic life.

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

Millions of men and women have thus come to believe in the fundamental program of Socialism. They know little or nothing of Marx and his theories, and care even less. It will be impossible to identify Socialism to-morrow and the day after to-morrow with any set of doctrines. The teachings of Marx will doubtless continue to be patiently studied and will continue to enlighten and inspire the studious few, making them more efficient as social teachers and interpreters, but never again will it be possible for Socialism to be defined in terms of Marxian theory.

III

When the outbreak of the war revealed the fact that national attachment and loyalty are more deep-rooted and influential than class loyalty, it became apparent that in the immediate future the class character of the Socialist movement must disappear. The experience of this war holds little to encourage and strengthen the belief and hope that the international solidarity of the working-class will, at any time in the near future, eliminate national feelings. The class feelings engendered in the economic conflict are, within the nation, extremely powerful,

INFLUENCE OF THE WORLD WAR

but when the issue is drawn between nations, national feelings, which have their roots much deeper in the life of the race than class feelings, soon demonstrate their supremacy. The manner in which, in every country, the proletariat has joined with other classes in the defense of national liberty and independence and opportunity proves conclusively that when the war is ended Socialists must view the class conflict in society in a new light.

The sectarian self-righteousness and exclusiveness of Socialism are being completely shattered by the war. In all the great belligerent countries Socialist leaders who before the war scornfully refused to co-operate with the bourgeois parties have found themselves working side by side with the despised bourgeoisie, just as the Socialist working-men have fought in the trenches side by side with aristocrats and plutocrats. Socialists have entered cabinets and become responsible ministers of state; they have assumed charge of railways, the production of munitions, food distribution, and other vital services of war. They have done this because of the urge of a great and imperative need which would take no account of their theories. Many of them, doubtless, sincerely believe

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

that the arrangement is a temporary one; that the war must be ended sooner or later, and that with the coming of peace they will return to their old class-conscious exclusiveness. They believe that it will be possible to restore the lines which have been broken down.

In this they are probably mistaken. There is no likelihood that any such return to pre-war conditions will be realized. There is, on the contrary, every reason to expect that the habit of co-operating with non-Socialist groups and parties acquired during the war will be found to be unbreakable. The need for such co-operation will in all lands become even more vital and pressing after the war. The work of reconstruction will require the united genius and resources of all classes quite as surely as the work of carrying on the war has done. Vast schemes of restoration and reconstruction will have to be undertaken; whole provinces which have been laid waste will have to be reclaimed and built up; towns and villages must be rebuilt and the whole economic system on which millions of lives depend must be recreated.

All this must profoundly affect the proletariat, dealing as it does with the most

INFLUENCE OF THE WORLD WAR

vital things of life. Housing conditions will be determined, for example, which will affect the lives of the working-class for generations to come. Standards of employment must, in the very nature of the case, become subject to a more comprehensive review than has yet been known. Then, too, there must be vast and far-reaching social readjustments: millions of broken and maimed men, capable of only partial service in industry at most, must be cared for; millions of children made orphans by the war must become wards of the state; enormous war indebtedness must be liquidated somehow. These are only a few of the outstanding and obvious features of the great problem which must confront all the nations when peace is restored. While the proletariat is vitally and immediately concerned, it cannot be claimed that other social classes are unaffected; neither can it be claimed that the proletariat can be relied upon to solve the problem alone and without the assistance and support of other classes.

That the Socialists, who, facing the needs of war, have for the common good actively and loyally co-operated with the parties of other social classes, will refuse to continue that co-operation for the needs of peace is

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

unlikely and well-nigh unthinkable. Some one has written learnedly of the "creative functions of earthquakes," and there is a profound challenge in the phrase. The San Francisco earthquake and fire destroyed much and seemed in the first moment of horror to be an unmitigated disaster. We know now, however, that by destroying old, outworn, corrupt, and disease-breeding slums it provided the need and the opportunity to build anew in conformity with the enlightenment of the age. The genius of the great metropolis of the west converted the disaster into a splendid opportunity. A great war like the present one is a kind of social earthquake, shattering ancient institutions and crystallizations, destroying much, but providing great and splendid opportunities for magnificent plans of reconstruction.

I trust that the simile of the earthquake will not seem to be far fetched. Against the pessimism and despair which see in the war only a catastrophe to be bemoaned I fain would set the view that it brings vast opportunities for socialization to be eagerly grasped. It is a fact not to be doubted by the mind that is both candid and intelligent that greater progress in socialization has

INFLUENCE OF THE WORLD WAR

been made since the beginning of the war than was made in the previous quarter of a century. That the socialization has not come just as we would have liked it to come must not blind us to the fact of its accomplishment. Too many Socialists fail to recognize and welcome the socialization which comes through other channels than they themselves contemplated. It is characteristic of earthquakes that they pay little heed to our poor designs. The mighty cataclysm which rends the earth's crust cannot be expected to follow any lines we may lay down for its guidance, and the great cataclysm which rends our social institutions will give little heed to the carefully devised plans we make. The important fact is to recognize the opportunities for socialization which the cataclysm brings and to seize and use them. Life is bound to prove far more potent than dogma in this matter; and because life is what it is we may confidently expect that the leaders of Socialist thought and action after the war, instead of wrapping themselves in a mantle of exclusiveness and self-righteous sectarianism, will gladly cooperate with all men and women of goodwill and social vision in the work of socializing society.

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

IV

One of the wholesome results of the war to be confidently expected is the emancipation of the international Socialist movement from German domination. Close observers of the movement during the past twenty-five years have come to realize the immense harm done to it by the domination in its councils of the leaders of the German Social Democracy. The reasons for this domination are not far to seek nor difficult to understand. Marx, Engels, Lassalle, Kautsky—whoever is familiar with the subject must realize the fact that these names have represented a great and far-reaching intellectual leadership in the modern Socialist movement.

It is no discredit to these great thinkers to recognize the fact that they little understood the psychology of any people except those of Germany. Marx and Engels resided in England for many years, and *Das Kapital* is in many respects the product of English economic thought; yet neither Marx nor Engels ever understood the people among whom they resided, and he who reads with open mind the history of the first Socialist International must see that much of the schism and contention in that organization

INFLUENCE OF THE WORLD WAR

was due to the failure of Marx and Engels to appreciate the points of view of French and English Socialists.

Then, too, the greater numerical strength of the movement in Germany, its highly efficient organization, and the degree of parliamentary success attained by it, caused the German Social Democracy to be highly esteemed by the Socialists of other countries, and its leaders to be listened to with a degree of humility which frequently bordered upon servility. Thus before the war it had become impossible for the international Socialist movement to take any step which was not sanctioned by the German Socialists. If they objected to the holding of a congress or to a meeting of the International Socialist Bureau, their objection was uniformly successful.

It is impossible to believe that such predominance can ever again be accorded to the representatives of the Socialist Party which so flagrantly and cynically betrayed the international Socialist movement. The vast German Social Democracy, so like the Prussian military system in its despotism and mechanical efficiency, has been shattered, and that fact, together with the contempt in which the Socialist majority is held by the

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

Socialists of all other lands, will insure the freedom of future international Socialist congresses from that abject and servile acceptance of German rule characteristic of past congresses. In the future British, French, Russian, and American Socialists will be listened to with far greater respect than in the past.

v

Socialists have always, since the days of Marx, boasted their internationalism. The symbol of the movement has been the blood-red emblem typifying that all mankind is of one blood and of one flesh. Its myriads have marched to the inspiring shibboleth: "Working-men of all countries, unite! You have nothing to lose but your chains; you have a world to gain." But the war soon revealed the fact that, as so often happens in great movements, religious and political, those who repeated the formulæ of internationalism and shouted its battle-cries, and believed that they were united in a common faith, had largely deceived themselves.

The challenge of the war, penetrating to the uttermost depths, revealed that internationalism meant different things to different minds. To some it meant the ob-

INFLUENCE OF THE WORLD WAR

literation of nationalities and the repudiation of purely national obligations; to others it meant the maintenance of nationalities upon terms of friendly co-operation and equal opportunity, and the acceptance of the ideal of service to all nations through service to one's own nation; to still others internationalism apparently had meant no more than a pious sentiment, a hope of perfect mutuality of interests among nations by-and-by, but in the mean time loyalty to the nation above all else. The Scheidemanns, the Suddekums, and the Davids in Germany, for example, accepted the vicious doctrine summed up in the phrase, "My country! May it ever be right, but, right or wrong, my country!" as fully as the most jingoistic nationalists.

Out of this war there must come some sort of international organization. The brilliant series of addresses and papers by President Wilson contain the most eloquent and profound statements of the new internationalism yet made. By an irony of history that is far from uncommon, the greatest and noblest statements of Socialist internationalism have come from one who does not call himself a Socialist. The importance of these statements lies in the fact that they are not

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

merely the creations of a brilliant and courageous intellect, but that they reflect the genius of the nation and its traditions. America is a nation whose guiding principles and whose traditions are entirely consistent with the highest internationalism. We have no interests the realization of which requires us to hinder the development of any other people. The fullest realization of our national ideals is quite compatible with the happiness and well-being of all other nations. America is a living example of that nationalism which always leads to a generous and worthy internationalism. In the readjustment of the world's relations, the creation of a democratic organization of international relations, which must be begun as soon as the din of battle is ended, all the best elements of the Socialist movement in all lands will be found working for the President's program.

They who dream that after this war is over love of country will disappear from the heart and mind of the proletariat, and that national patriotism will be lost in devotion to humanity at large, indulge dreams for which there is no sanction in rationality. Even the mystics in Russia, the Bolsheviki, find in the midst of their zeal for inter-

INFLUENCE OF THE WORLD WAR

nationalism surging currents of national inspiration which cannot be denied. While Trotzky and Lenine indulge in tirades against nation-love submerged nationalities are asserting their right to autonomy.

The war has broken the machinery of the Socialist parties, but it has left the soul of Socialism unscathed. Faith in Socialist parties may be difficult to rekindle, but faith in Socialism itself is stronger than ever before. The earthquake has broken the prison walls and liberated the spirit of Socialism. Freed from the trammels of dogma, the Socialist impulses of the forward-looking men and women of to-day can find a more fruitful field than ever at any time in history. The future belongs to Socialism—to a Socialism redeemed and recreated, a Socialism spiritualized and enlightened, co-operating with all that makes for man's dominion in the universe.

VII

DEMOCRACY APPLIED TO
FOREIGN POLICIES AND
INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

VII

DEMOCRACY APPLIED TO FOREIGN POLICIES AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

I

IT is the essence of our faith that the solution of the problem of democracy must be sought in more democracy. Political democracy must be made more democratic, and industry must be made as responsive to democratic rule as government is. That is the imperious urge behind the unrest of nations.

There is a growing conviction that the same mighty solvent must be applied to the problems of international relations. The world cannot be "made safe for democracy" until the relations of nations with one another are governed by democratic principles. "Government of the people, by the people, for the people" must be applied to the foreign

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

policies of nations as well as to their domestic policies. This democratization of internationalism is perhaps the greatest single task confronting the democratic nations of the world.

Definition is required here. What do we mean by democratic internationalism? In a general way we understand clearly enough the implications of democracy in the government and industry of a nation. It implies equality of rights and a corresponding equality of obligations. All citizens enjoy equal rights of participation in the making of the laws and cardinal decisions of the nation and have an equal obligation to abide by such laws and decisions. We have not advanced far in the direction of industrial democracy as yet. The economic life of no existing nation is readily responsive to the popular will. But the first steps have been taken and, thanks to the untiring propaganda of Social Democracy, a program of action for the immediate future has been shaped and is accepted by a large and influential section of the electorate in all progressive nations. Its representatives are in the parliaments of many countries.

Democratic internationalism requires that in their relations with one another states must

DEMOCRACY AND FOREIGN POLICIES

be governed by the same principles of right, equity, and morals as those which govern the relations of individuals in democratic nations. The doctrine that states in their relations are exempt from and superior to the moral law is incompatible with democracy in international relations. This doctrine is not of Prussian origin, though it has been most highly developed under the ægis of Prussia; it is the basic doctrine of imperialism and inspires every imperialistic ambition. Contempt for international laws, treaties, and conventions, arrogance toward other nations and disregard of their interests and rights, are characteristic of imperialism, and as subversive of democracy in international life as similar conduct by individuals in a nation would be subversive of democracy in its political and industrial life.

II

One of the most prolific sources of wars and international misunderstandings is the undemocratic manner in which states conduct their relations with one another. Even the most democratic nations have hardly passed from the methods of autocracy in this important sphere of activity. Treaties and

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

agreements are made by governments secretly and without the sanction of their peoples. The great world war was made possible by this vicious and undemocratic practice. Because of secret alliances and treaties what might have been a localized war, confined to two or three nations, inevitably involved the greater part of civilized mankind. There is nothing more revolting to the democratic sense than the secret and autocratic disposition of national wealth, power, and honor as it was done in the treaty of triple alliance in which Bismarck enmeshed Germany, Austria, and Italy. Nor was the Triple Alliance one whit less repulsive to the democratic sense than were the equally secret and autocratic agreements of the Triple Entente.

How utterly autocratic the conduct of foreign relations still is, even in democratic nations, was shown in a most striking manner by the treaty which Great Britain entered into with Germany in the summer of 1914, a few weeks before the outbreak of the war. That treaty, never yet published, was an attempt to dispose, secretly and autocratically, of nothing less than the political and economic development of a considerable part of Asia.

The satisfaction expressed by German

DEMOCRACY AND FOREIGN POLICIES

political commentators leads to the opinion that this treaty was a genuine attempt on the part of England to promote harmonious and peaceful relations between the two great rival powers, but it is quite likely that it would have provoked the antagonism of other nations, Russia and Japan, for example. Be that how it may, the people of neither nation knew anything about it. Herein lies the essential viciousness of secret diplomacy: the peace of the world and the destinies of nations are made mere pawns in the game of despots.

In a telegram of congratulation addressed to the Russian Prime Minister Lloyd George said, "There can be no lasting peace until the responsibility of governments to their people is clearly established from one end of Europe to the other." To this truism of democracy we may add that peace between nations can never be permanently secured until secret diplomacy is eliminated and all international treaties, conventions, and agreements represent the free-will of peoples democratically expressed.

This doctrine is implicit in our American democracy. As we recognize that all governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed, and all laws derive

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

their validity from the general consent of the people, so in international affairs we must accept the principle that treaties and agreements must depend for their validity upon the consent of the peoples of the contracting states. No treaty, convention, or agreement entered into by a government without the express consent of its people ought to be regarded as binding that people.

In the very forefront of the program of democratic internationalism to be urged by the Socialists in all lands is the establishment of the principle that treaties and other international agreements can only be entered into by popularly elected and controlled parliaments, in open session. Furthermore, democratic nations must seek to make it a part of international law that no treaties or other agreements among nations to which the peoples of the contracting states have not given their sanction shall be recognized as having any validity.

III

The peace of democracy, based upon a righteous regard for the interest of all humanity, is vastly different from the peace which is attained through alliances and con-

DEMOCRACY AND FOREIGN POLICIES

certs of powers imposing their will upon the rest of mankind. Soon or late, all alliances designed to insure peace bring counter alliances and wars. The Triple Alliance gave birth to the Triple Entente, and from the rivalry of these war inevitably sprang.

It is essential to the realization of democracy in international relations that the great "strategic waterways" of the world shall cease to be monopolized and controlled by individual nations, and by them used to impose their rule upon other nations. England's control and armament of the Suez Canal and the Strait of Gibraltar; Germany's control and armament of the Bight of Helgoland; Turkey's domination of the Dardanelles; and our own armed control of the Panama Canal are illustrations of great strategic waterways, of common interest to all civilized nations, armed with a sole view to the furtherance of the interests of the particular nations as against all the rest of mankind. All such waterways should be internationalized, and whatever fortification and defense they may require should be provided by the associated nations.

Freedom of trade intercourse is an essential condition of democratic internationalism. Trade concessions which bestow mo-

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

nopoly advantages, preferential tariffs, "favored nation" agreements, and all other forms of inequitable discrimination in the matter of trade privileges must be abolished if international democracy is to endure. All prohibitive and discriminatory taxes on trade and commerce are anti-democratic and inevitably create jealousy and friction among nations. International free-trade is, therefore, a fundamental requirement of international democracy. Protective and preferential tariffs and all discriminatory taxes and franchises are implicitly imperialistic. Democratic internationalism requires that there shall be no hindrance to the free exchange of the products of all nations. There can be no recognition of the right of any nation to monopolize its own markets or those of its colonies to the disadvantage of the peoples of other nations. If trade regulations are imperatively necessary they should be formulated by an international tribunal representing all nations, and based upon the idea of universal equality of economic opportunity for all peoples.

IV

Theoretically, the principles which apply to trade should apply also to travel and

DEMOCRACY AND FOREIGN POLICIES

migration. From the standpoint of pure idealistic democracy there can be no justification for interference with the free movements of human beings. If all countries and their colonies must be open on free and equal terms to the commerce of all nations, why not also to their citizens?

Too many factors enter into this matter of the right of a nation to control the admission of alien peoples to permit the formulation of a single, comprehensive rule governing it. Unless we are to abandon every vestige of national sovereignty and independence, we must admit the right of each nation to regulate the admission of aliens. True hospitality does not require a man to receive into his household more guests than he can accommodate and serve. In like manner the hospitality implicit in democratic internationalism requires no nation to receive more aliens than it can assimilate and properly care for. To admit more laborers than steady and wholesome employment can be provided for at wages sufficient to secure an efficient and worthy standard of living is not consistent with democratic ideals.

If political and economic assimilation were the only factors to be taken into account,

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

the problem of immigration in relation to democratic internationalism would be an easy one. There is, however, the perplexing question of racial differences and antipathies to complicate the problem. Surely it cannot be a requisite of international democracy that the people of any nation must submit to the settlement within their borders of masses of people of another race so different that they must always be unassimilated, a race apart. The terrible problem of the negro in America is an illustration of the real meaning of such a racial distinction. If democracy in international relations requires our acquiescence in the progressive development of another such insoluble problem we must not expect democratic internationalism to prevail.

We know very little about the biological assimilation of races. Apparently the crossing of widely contrasting races or species tends in general to a weak and undesirable progeny. But how shall we measure the difference between the Anglo-Saxon and the Mongolian, for example? Is the difference between the typical American—who is the product of much racial intermingling—and the Japanese greater or less than that which existed between the Anglo-Saxon and the

DEMOCRACY AND FOREIGN POLICIES

North American Indian, the union of which races often resulted so admirably? These are questions to be answered by the scientific investigator rather than by the politician or statesman. We can only assert as a postulate of democracy in international relations that freedom of travel and migration cannot be absolute, but must be subject to the right of the people of each nation to self-protection against the overwhelming influx of non-assimilable races.

Perhaps the solution of our problem will be found to lie in the removal of the regulation of immigration from national jurisdiction to the jurisdiction of the international government which must be developed if democratic internationalism is to prevail. The United States of America can hardly be relied upon to appraise the Japanese without prejudice or passion. If the matter of the right of the Japanese to settle in the United States is to be determined absolutely by the government of the United States, without reference to the judgments of the rest of civilized mankind, there can hardly be any immunity from that ill-feeling between the two nations which makes for war. Of course, if, instead of the migration of masses of a highly civilized people like the

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

Japanese, we consider the possible migration of hordes of uncivilized peoples, the problem at once becomes simpler of solution, because its essential features are more obvious. In any scheme of democratic world organization provision must be made for the supervision of backward, barbarous, and semi-civilized peoples. They must, for their own good and that of the rest of mankind, be placed under the collective tutelage of the associated civilized states.

v

There can be no abiding efficient democratic organization of international relations apart from the fullest freedom of the seas. Teutonic diplomacy has made a characteristically sinister use of this phrase as a mask for the Prussian ambition to unite to its invincible army an equally invincible navy—a twofold supremacy which would insure the domination of the world by German imperialism.

What the phrase, “freedom of the seas,” really means to internationalists is that the seas and all connecting navigable rivers and canals must be open without hindrance or discrimination to the peaceful navigation of

DEMOCRACY AND FOREIGN POLICIES

the people of all nations. The duty of policing the seas and maintaining the security of passenger and freight traffic thereon must be the collective function of all civilized nations acting through some kind of world organization. Dominion of the seas must belong to the federation of states; to permit such dominion to be exercised by any individual nation or self-selected group of nations is inconsistent with world democracy. Great Britain has used her tremendous naval predominance fairly, upon the whole, and with generous regard to the interests of other nations. Her navy swept piracy from the Seven Seas. As a volunteer policeman of the oceans, Great Britain has done much good work. But along with much that is admirable British dominion over the oceans has its evil and undemocratic features. The democratic organization of the world requires that the great instruments of world government shall be controlled by all civilized nations acting in concert.

VI

International democracy must rest upon the broad principle of the inviolability of nations. This principle is subject, however,

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

to certain important exceptions. The right of a nation to liberty and freedom from interference or restraint is conditional, not absolute. A nation incapable of maintaining law and order, given over to anarchy and unable or unwilling to afford reasonable security to life and property, is a menace to the well-being of other nations. Such a nation has no right to liberty of action any more than has a lawless citizen a right to liberty of action within the nation. It must be subject to the rule of the associated civilized states.

Again, the principles of international democracy do not require the inviolability of nations or empires based upon tyranny or those whose conduct toward their own citizens or the citizens of other nations outrages the moral sense of mankind. The sovereignty of nations is limited by the higher sovereignty of the world-state. The cause of liberty and democracy cannot require the protection of tyrants. Nor does it require the maintenance of the integrity of nations which include conquered and subject peoples, civilized and capable of self-government, held in the nation by force and against their will. These subject nationalities need and deserve assistance as Amer-

DEMOCRACY AND FOREIGN POLICIES

ica did in 1776, Italy in 1859, and Cuba in 1898. To deny that help and to aid their oppressors, in the name of the principle of the inviolability of nations, would be a base betrayal of democracy. Above the inviolability of nations and their right to maintain the *status quo* must be set the imprescriptible right of civilized peoples to dispose of themselves within the bounds of international law and morality. There would be neither sense nor morality, for example, in regarding the Austrian Empire as an inviolable entity in the sense that the right of Hungary or the Czecho-Slovaks to complete independence from Austrian rule cannot be recognized.

Finally, the inviolability of nations as a principle of action must not be interpreted as giving to any nation the exclusive control of natural resources or lines of communication essential to the well-being of mankind. That would be as intolerable in the society of nations as similar conduct by an individual would be in any one of the nations. The governing principle in all international relations must be the common welfare. Wherever the claims of a national group conflict with the larger interests of mankind, the latter must prevail. Either

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

we must admit that principle or abandon all idea of a democratic organization of the world.

VII

Since the plan of the Duc de Sully for a Great Council of the Powers was promulgated by Henry IV of France, at the beginning of the seventeenth century, schemes and plans for a world organization to insure peace have been numerous. From the Duc de Sully to Henri La Fontaine stretches a long and splendid line of noble idealism. It is not a criticism to note the fact that most of these schemes of world federation have been concerned with international peace rather than with international democracy. It is true that the plan of Immanuel Kant was based upon a federation of democratic states and was in other ways essentially democratic. Its object, however, was peace rather than democracy.

That there must be some kind of international organization with power to maintain the peace of the world is now generally accepted. The prime ministers of England and France, the German Imperial Chancellor, and the President of the United States have declared their belief in this. Amid the din

DEMOCRACY AND FOREIGN POLICIES

and confusion of the time the one constructive proposal to secure serious attention is that in the future there must be some international power to maintain the peace of the world.

The central idea of the League to Enforce Peace is not new. Every great and protracted war gives rise to movements and plans for the permanent establishment of peace. The Napoleonic wars, for example, produced the Holy Alliance, described by an English statesman as "a piece of sublime mysticism and nonsense," and the Grand Alliance. The former, devised by that strange religious zealot, Alexander I of Russia, was an attempt to establish on a religious basis a league of European nations whose primary purpose was to be the preservation of peace. How it degenerated into a league for the preservation of autocracy and became synonymous with oppression and hatred of liberty every student of history knows. It strengthened the idea of the divine right of kings and the kindred idea of a spiritual brotherhood of kings. Its principles were invoked by Alexander's successor when, in 1849, he rushed to the aid of his brother-sovereign of Austria and helped crush the Hungarian revolt.

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

A closer parallel to the present widely discussed scheme of a league of nations to be formed at the close of the present war, to enforce peace upon the basis of whatever settlement of the war is effected, was the Quadruple or Grand Alliance which aimed at the overthrow of Napoleon and his dynasty, the curbing of France, and the preservation of peace. Like the Holy Alliance, the Grand Alliance soon became a bulwark of despotism and oppression. Its history forms a sinister chapter of diplomatic intrigue which may well cause us to distrust schemes to ally the nations of the world for the maintenance of peace by force of arms. We may well pause to ask some questions: for example, when this war is concluded, is it intended that the readjustments of territorial sovereignty the victors are able to insist upon are to be permanently maintained? And if this is the intention, how can it be realized except through the domination of the league of nations by the victors? Finally, if the league is to be thus dominated, what is to become of the democracy we set out to realize?

If we keep the ideal of democratic internationalism before us as our goal, with the

DEMOCRACY AND FOREIGN POLICIES

understanding that international peace is desirable only in so far as it is consistent with that ideal—that is, with the largest interest of mankind—we shall insist that this nation enter no league of nations for the enforcement of peace which does not provide adequate safeguards for international democracy. Not even for the sake of the preservation of peace must we compromise our democracy by alliance with despotic nations in any sort of league of nations. It must be, in the words of President Wilson, “a partnership of democratic nations.”

Instead of the alliance of governments, made without reference to the will of their peoples, there must be the co-operation of peoples for the promotion of their common democratic interests. We must insist that the United States shall enter no league of nations for the better government of the world unless all the nations in the league are democratized and their governments chosen by and responsible to popularly elected parliaments. Upon this point there can be no compromise. Everywhere and always the common people are for peace and against aggression. Once we place the government of nations absolutely in the hands

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

of the people, sweeping away the secret and autocratic methods of conducting international relations, peace will automatically result—the peace of democracy and the fraternalism of peoples; not the peace of compromise or submission to despotic power.

VIII

Given a league of democratic nations with representatives from each country chosen by and responsible to the people, the creation of the necessary machinery for its great task would appear to present no very baffling problems. As in the nation the individual surrenders some measure of personal freedom in order to enjoy the enlarged freedom which results from the organization of the state, so in the federation of nations the individual nation must surrender some of its freedom of action in order to secure the larger freedom of action resulting from the federation. To promote international understanding, comity, and helpfulness, and to facilitate the just development of international law, there should be an international parliament—a realization of Kant's great vision of a permanent international congress of representatives of democratic

DEMOCRACY AND FOREIGN POLICIES

states. It is of the highest importance that this parliament should be composed of delegates responsible to the parliaments of the nations they represent, and that it should meet frequently at stated intervals.

The question of the basis of representation to such an international parliament has been the source of much disputation. Shall all nations, small and great alike, have equal voting power or must there be some scheme of proportional representation? Obviously, if the decisions of the parliament are to be binding, democracy requires that the latter course be followed, in which case it is to be feared that the smaller nations will stand a poor chance, being permanently at a disadvantage. If, however, instead of regarding the decisions of the parliament as final, we insist that all proposals formulated by it must be referred to the associated states for ratification or rejection by their democratically elected parliaments, or, even better, by democratically conducted popular referenda, the need for any scheme of proportional representation in the international parliament itself disappears. The parliament is not in that case a law-making body; it is a law-formulating body—an advisory council of nations. There can be no valid

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

democratic objection to having as the basis of such a body one vote for each affiliated nation.

The federation of nations will, naturally, provide for some permanent council of mediation, conciliation, and arbitration, to which disputes between the states may be referred for amicable adjustment. Experience has shown, however, that this is not enough. To insure the just and equitable settlement of international disputes there must be an international court of justice with jurisdiction in all disputes between nations. To the court might also be referred, at the option of either party, disputes between nations and the citizens of other nations and certain classes of disputes between the citizens of different nations. The decisions of the court should be binding upon all parties concerned, except that appeal from its decisions to the international parliament might wisely be provided for. Unless overruled as a result of such appeal, the decision of the court must have the full authority of law and be enforceable by the powers of the associated states.

With such a democratic basis as suggested, a league of nations with adequate power to enforce peace is neither chimerical nor in-

DEMOCRACY AND FOREIGN POLICIES

compatible with democratic internationalism. The creation of an international naval and military council would make possible not only the direction of the international forces necessary for measures of police patrol, constraint, and defense, but also the successful control of militarism and navalism in the affiliated nations.

President Wilson has said that the limitation of national armaments is "the most immediately and intensely practical question connected with the fortunes of nations and mankind." Under the guidance of such a council, national armaments could be progressively reduced until they became practically negligible. If it be objected that such a naval and military council would necessarily be dominated by professional naval and military men, and therefore unlikely to be zealous in the elimination of national armaments, it remains to be said that at least they could be trusted to see that the provision of the forces for international purposes was adequate. With this important function properly provided for, the democratic parliaments of the associated nations would take care of the problem of national armaments and effectively curb both navalism and militarism. In such cir-

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

cumstances there is no appreciable chance that any democratically elected parliament in the world would vote the necessary credits for the maintenance of great naval or military armaments.

It would be possible to substitute for private enterprise in the manufacture and sale of arms and munitions of war—which is itself a potent cause of war—a sort of international collectivization of the industry. All the arms and munitions needed by the individual states, as well as those necessary for the international forces, might well be produced by a department of the international government under the direction of the international naval and military commission. Such a method would get rid of one of the chief incitements to war as well as of some of the gravest and most difficult problems incidental to the relations of nations one with another.

IX

The proposal to bind all nations together in a democratic world-federation based upon community of interests is no longer to be regarded as utopian and chimerical. It has passed from the domain of theory and specu-

DEMOCRACY AND FOREIGN POLICIES

lation to that of actual world politics. The elements of democracy are more numerous and more powerful than at the close of the Napoleonic wars. Even the imperialism which seemed so far removed from all democratic movements is apparently to contribute to the new democratic internationalism.

Take the British Empire, which is a very important nucleus of a world organization. Since August, 1914, we have heard much of the remarkable strength and solidarity of the great "Empire on which the sun never sets." Germany made a costly blunder when she based her plans for military conquest upon the assumption that the great colonies and dependencies of Great Britain would rebel at the first blast of war and assert their independence. Nothing of the sort occurred. Instead they rallied to the aid and defense of the mother country in a remarkable way. The fact is that the British Empire ceased to exist. In its place there has been developed through the war a federation, a commonwealth of peoples, including India, drawn together by the great common purposes of the war. When the war ends, this great organization of nations and peoples will need and obtain a democratic constitution. Far-seeing British statesmen in the

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

latter half of the nineteenth century urged the formation of a great imperial federation, consisting of England and her colonies and dependencies, organized for their mutual advantage. The twentieth century has gone beyond the nineteenth-century vision; the federation which has been forged upon the anvil of the world war is democratic, not imperial.

Granted the victory of the Entente Allies over the Central Empires and their allies—and any other outcome of the war is unthinkable—there would appear to be no insuperable obstacle to the realization of the ideal of a democratically organized world-state. Never before in all history was a nation confronted with an opportunity so resplendent as that which now confronts the United States of America. It is our proud privilege, as it is our solemn obligation, to use the great influence which is ours in this world crisis to see that there is erected not merely a great international force sufficient to prevent war, but a fraternal union of free mutually helpful democracies.

VIII

WHAT A REFERENDUM
ON WAR WOULD MEAN

VIII

WHAT A REFERENDUM ON WAR WOULD MEAN

MANY thoughtful and sincere Socialists and social reformers who cannot be justly accused, or even seriously suspected, of being consciously pro-German, have echoed the demand of the Socialist Party, the People's Council, and other pacifist organizations that war should only be decided upon by a popular referendum in which the entire body of citizens is privileged to participate.

This proposal presents a most attractive appearance to the ardent believer in democracy. There is a "sweet reasonableness" about it which is most alluring. It is a seductively plausible demand. Nevertheless, I believe it to be essentially undemocratic and reactionary. In advocating it social radicals are imperiling their own profoundest interests.

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

In all the history of the international Socialist movement the proposal was never seriously advanced until some two or three years ago, when Mr. Allan L. Benson, who later became the Presidential candidate of the Socialist Party, vigorously advocated it. At that time I actively opposed Mr. Benson's proposals, not, however, upon the fundamental principle of submitting the question of war or peace to a referendum vote, but upon certain details of his scheme. Mr. Morris Hillquit, now the intellectual head of the People's Council which has championed the referendum proposal of Mr. Benson, then opposed the project upon similar grounds. I do not now recall that in any Socialist conference or congress, national or international, the subject was ever seriously discussed prior to that time.

My present opposition to the proposal is directed against the fundamental principle, not against mere details. Subsequent reflection upon the subject and a patient and careful study of the necessary implications of the proposal have convinced me that the plan is fundamentally reactionary and not progressive, and that if adopted it would imperil, if not altogether destroy, our democracy. I have reached the conclusion

WHAT A REFERENDUM WOULD MEAN

that its adoption would of necessity impose upon this nation the worst evils of militarism and secret diplomacy. It seems desirable to state as clearly and concisely as possible the reasons for this rather sweeping judgment:

In the first place, all intelligent believers in the referendum as a democratic instrument will agree that nothing could be more undemocratic than to attempt to decide by referendum any matter concerning which full information was not available to the voting electorate. To ask people unfamiliar with the Chinese language to decide by referendum vote some disputed question of Chinese etymology would be no more foolish, and therefore undemocratic, than to ask people to decide a diplomatic issue by referendum while unfamiliar with the facts in the case. To the naïve suggestion that the facts should be made known to the electorate it is only necessary to reply that, as every well-informed person knows, the mass of the electorate cannot possibly be universally informed upon the developments of critical international relations as they change from day to day and from hour to hour.

Let us suppose a case: the government of the nation concludes that certain hostile acts

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

by the agents of a foreign government are so serious as to raise the issue of possible war. Under the law this issue can only be determined by a popular referendum vote. How shall the question be submitted to the electorate to insure an intelligent understanding as the basis of the vote? In actual practice such a referendum can only be upon a simple decision, yes or no. It is not possible to get into such a popular vote numerous subtle qualifications and conditions in the same manner as they can be included in the vote of a deliberate assembly. The question to be voted upon must be simple and direct, as, for example, "Shall war be declared against the offending government?" The vote upon this question must necessarily be a simple "yes" or "no." What a perversion of democracy this procedure spells!

It may be objected that it is not impossible to include in the proposition to be voted upon some qualifying proviso. Within very narrow limits this is indeed possible. For example, the question might be submitted in this form, "Shall war be declared against the offending government unless due and adequate apology and reparation are made?" Here again we must face the fact that the vote upon this question must

WHAT A REFERENDUM WOULD MEAN

be a simple "yes" or "no," and if the decision is in the affirmative it is obvious that the determination of what are "due and adequate apology and reparation" must be left to some constituted authority. It can never be the function of the voting electorate to decide that matter. Thus, in actual practice, it will remain for constituted authority to declare war in many instances.

A well-known pacifist writer has declared that a referendum vote of the entire voting electorate of the United States can be taken and tabulated in two months. I am disposed to doubt this as a practical question, but do not care to argue it. I prefer to consider a much more serious matter. Suppose that on the 1st of January the simple question, "Shall war be declared?" is submitted to a referendum vote, and, in order to consider the case for the referendum at its best and strongest, suppose that an entirely accurate and impartial statement of the controversy between the two governments is widely published and even attached to the ballot. The vote is to be returned and counted by a given date—March 1st will do as well as any other. In order that this may be done the overwhelming majority of the votes must be cast by the middle of

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

February. By that time, indeed, the issue will have been decided, though the result will not be known.

In the mean time, in the enemy country, stirred to its depths by the peril of war, a popular revolt against the government has occurred. Either a new government which is ready to make honorable amends is returned to power or sufficient pressure is brought upon the existing government to compel it to offer some apology or reparation, or perhaps to propose the submission of the matter in dispute to arbitration. Obviously we have, in either event, a new condition which the voters could not take into account in casting their votes. To declare war in the circumstances might be a stupendous blunder, or even worse than that, a crime against civilization. Yet the popular mandate for war will have been cast and will have to be carried out, unless, indeed, we are to contemplate an autocratic setting aside of the popular mandate by some constituted authority, in which case the democracy which the referendum was to achieve is destroyed. If it is undemocratic for a representative parliament or elected government to declare war without consulting the citizens' wishes, how much more un-

WHAT A REFERENDUM WOULD MEAN

democratic would it be for such a parliament or elected government to overrule the decision of the people registered by popular referendum!

Now let us suppose that, instead of being submitted in the simple form I have been discussing, the question of war or peace is submitted in a more general fashion, is the situation very much improved? Do we escape from our dilemma? I think not. Suppose the question on the ballot reads, "Shall war be declared against the offending government, unless on or before a certain date due apology and honorable amends are offered to this government?" Unless the exact and precise terms of the apology and honorable amends are specified upon the ballot (which will rarely be practicable), the actual decision of whether there shall be war or peace will have to be rendered by some constituted authority. For if some apology and some measure of atonement should be offered by the offending government, it would be quite possible and proper for the constituted authority of the nation to decide that these were not satisfactory. Should the referendum have been decided in the affirmative, war would have to be declared as soon as the government decided

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

that the proffered apology and atonement were not satisfactory. Clearly, the real decision for war would be that of the constituted government; that of the people would be tentative merely.

If we conceive it to be possible to escape this difficulty by including in the question to be voted upon the precise apology and reparation required, we shall only escape one difficulty to embrace a greater one. The offending government might offer an apology ample enough, but differing in form from the one demanded, and might very honestly offer abundant reparation, but differing in form from that demanded. In the circumstances, to make war against that repentant government would be a crime against humanity and would bring upon the nation declaring war the condemnation of all mankind. Yet, if the referendum should have resulted affirmatively that crime against humanity would have to be committed in the name of democracy!

Considered as a practical instrument for determining the issues of peace and war between nations, the referendum is obviously far inferior to and less democratic than representative parliamentary government.

Let me now turn to another serious ob-

WHAT A REFERENDUM WOULD MEAN

jection and point out briefly and clearly the frightful menace to the integrity of our democratic institutions which this much-heralded "democratic" measure necessarily involves: If the fundamental law of the land were to be so modified as to provide that war could only be declared by referendum vote of the people, every great power in the world whose interests were or might conceivably become opposed to ours would inevitably and naturally, for the conservation of its own interests, seek to control numerous and influential organs for influencing the public opinion of our nation.

Every student of modern European political history knows that one of the grave menaces to the integrity of national life, and a most fruitful source of corruption, has been the organized effort of the ruling classes and governments of nations to mold the thought of other countries through subsidies to newspapers, organizations, and other propaganda agencies, and the direct or indirect ownership and control of great and influential newspapers and periodicals. The record of the relations of Germany and France, in the past twenty-five years, is replete with illustrations of this evil. Since the outbreak of the European war, and especially since

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

the development of those difficulties between the United States and Germany which have culminated in war, it has been obvious that the Imperial German Government, through its agents, has done everything in its power to mold our American public opinion to serve German rather than American ends.

We have had repeated and indisputable evidences of the use of secretly disbursed funds to establish newspapers, magazines, news-services, and other forms of propaganda to the end of controlling the political opinion of this nation and making it serve the sinister designs of the Hohenzollern dynasty. In order to protect ourselves against this insidious menace we have found it necessary to curtail seriously that generous freedom of the press which has heretofore characterized our democracy. We chafe and fret under these new and unusual restraints and yearn to throw them off and return to our wonted freedom. We shall never return to that freedom, but must permanently bear the restraints necessity has imposed upon us, if we open the way to the maintenance of agencies within the nation for the control of our opinion in the interests of other nations. Secret diplomacy of the familiar type is surely bad enough and dangerous

WHAT A REFERENDUM WOULD MEAN

enough to a democracy such as our own. Infinitely more dangerous would be the menace of the existence at all times in this country of newspapers and other agencies for the molding of public opinion to serve the interests and policies of other governments.

The fact that an unscrupulous and conscienceless government, like the present government of Germany, for example, was maintaining such an agency in this country would force more decent and democratic governments, for their own protection, to maintain competing services for the molding of American public opinion. And we ourselves, as a mere matter of prudent self-protection, would have to maintain a similar system for the development in Germany and other nations of a public opinion favorable to us. Not only would we have to maintain in times of peace a secret service as extensive and efficient as that of the Hohenzollerns and the Romanoffs, but we should have to sap the very foundation of our democracy through the appropriation of immense funds to be secretly disbursed for propaganda in other lands without any accounting of which the public might know. This would mean "secret diplomacy" of the most sinister

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

type and would greatly add to the already too numerous war - provoking forces. So much we can learn from the present war and our own experience.

These reasons have forced me to the conclusion that the proposal made by the People's Council, the Socialist Party, and similar organizations, that war should only be declared by a referendum vote of the people, is altogether reactionary and would, if adopted, undermine and destroy the fabric of our democracy. That it should be advocated by men of such well-established reputations as reactionaries as Senator Stone, Senator Vardaman, ex-Senator Work, and others of the same general type, is understandable and not at all surprising. It is surprising and disappointing that intelligent Socialists and professed internationalists should give their support to a proposal so destructive of all that Socialism and internationalism imply.

APPENDIX
CHAPTERS IN SOCIALIST
CONTROVERSY

I

THE FIGHT IN THE PARTY EXECUTIVE

I

ON February 2, 1917, the Emergency Committee of the Socialist Party, acting for the National Executive Committee, sent the following telegram to President Wilson:

In behalf of the great multitude of Socialists in the United States, we, the National Emergency Committee of the Socialist Party, in order to preserve peace in our country, urge that a complete embargo be placed upon all shipments of whatsoever kind from the United States to any and all of the belligerent nations.

At the time when the war began we made this identical demand. We urged that this country should starve the war and feed America.

We took the position then, and we take it now, for the following reasons: First, because it is the only way in which our country can be made guiltless of

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

participation in the bloodshed of the war. Second, because it is the only way in which this country can take a genuinely neutral position. Third, because it is the only way in which this nation can keep its products at home, where they are sorely needed in order to assist in reducing the cost of living.

From the beginning of the war the United States has not been neutral. It has obeyed the letter of international law, but has constantly and viciously violated its spirit by shipping munitions and other supplies to one side when it was prevented by that side from shipping them to the other.

Piercing through technicalities and going to the heart of the matter, this is a flagrant violation of neutrality, because it helps one side and injures the other. It is also morally base, resulting as it does in the selfish plutocrats of our country enriching themselves at the expense of the warring nations and placing the guilt of murder at the door of the American people.

By this means the United States has helped to kill in cold blood millions of our fellow human beings. At the same time, the exportation of the substance of the country to the warring nations has increased the cost of living among the masses of our people and thereby increased their sufferings.

All three of these wrongs—the participation in bloodshed, the anti-neutrality, and the exportation of our substance—would be avoided by placing an embargo upon all shipments to all of the belligerents.

In addition, it would tend to bring the war to a close. We are sincerely neutral, and we heartily agree with you in the opinion that the interests of humanity demand that there “should be no victor

APPENDIX

in this war." Certainly it would be much more likely so to end if the United States should cease to help one side.

This plan would also preserve peace in our own country. It would be preposterous for this country to go to war for the right to permit its selfish rich to still further enrich themselves by acting as accessories in murder.

Mr. President, we most earnestly remind you that the war-like opinions expressed in the daily press of this country are dictated by these same wicked and selfish vultures.

We, the Socialist Party, constitute a large portion of the common mass of the people, whose voices are not heard in the metropolitan press, but whose hearts are right and who do not want war. It is the voice of the common people that you should hear before you act.

Follow the example of your illustrious predecessor, Thomas Jefferson, Mr. President, and have a complete embargo placed on all shipments. It will end the war.

That message was signed by Victor L. Berger, of Milwaukee; John M. Work, of Chicago; and the National Secretary of the party, Adolph Germer.

As a member of the National Executive Committee, on whose behalf the Emergency Committee had acted, I opposed the motion to hold mass meetings in favor of the embargo demand, which, be it remembered,

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

had been previously urged by the German and Austrian ambassadors. To the National Secretary of the party I telegraphed:

I vote "No" on the motion submitted, which might well have been written in the German Foreign Office. The severance of diplomatic relations with Germany was necessary and justified. I hope other neutral nations will follow suit and help crush the German military machine and thereby free German people. To preserve the limitations which civilization has imposed upon warfare, especially immunity of non-combatants from murder, spoliation, and slavery, is a solemn duty. I hope our activities will be limited to economic rather than military force. Any movement to that end I will gladly support.

My opposition to the demand for an embargo was based upon two major reasons: In the first place, I was satisfied that there was behind it a very active sympathy for Germany's cause; that its advocates were, in many instances, strongly pro-German in the most complete sense of that overworked term. I knew that the same men who in the name of neutrality were demanding that the President place an embargo on munitions and other supplies when it was to Germany's interest to do so, had been violent in their abuse of that same President of the United States when an order was

APPENDIX

issued to place an embargo upon the shipment of munitions into Mexico. The Socialists of this country were greatly disturbed by that order and vigorously condemned it as an act of unneutrality directed against Carranza, virtually making the United States a participant in the war on the other side. Yet those same Socialists advocated in the name of neutrality, in the European war crisis, precisely the policy they had denounced as unneutral in the case of Mexico!

The second reason for my opposition to the demand for an embargo was based upon the fundamental principles of historic Socialism. On several occasions I pointed out that if the placing of an embargo on munitions and other war supplies should become a settled policy of nations, pending the realization of universal disarmament, militarism would be greatly strengthened thereby at the expense and the peril of democratic nations. I pointed out that in the past, whenever the Socialists of Europe had been called upon to oppose large military expenditures, they met the arguments of their opponents, the militarists, by saying: "We shall never be at war with all the world at once; we shall, therefore, be able, in the event of war, to buy all we need in the open

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

market. We do not need to build up huge piles of arms which will probably never be used." This had always been a powerful argument against excessive military expenditures. Free trade in munitions was one of the bulwarks of the democratic nations against militarism.

If, however, we do away with this free trade in munitions and forbid all nations to supply munitions to belligerents, before universal disarmament is attained (in which case the prohibition would be needless and useless), we virtually make it necessary for every nation to maintain itself at all times in a condition of military efficiency. We must, for example, as a matter of ordinary prudence, be at all times of peace ready to meet the possible attack of the greatest nation whose might could be used against us. We could not do otherwise than maintain an enormous military establishment which would be fatal to our democracy. The nation would be turned into a permanent armed camp.

Thus the Socialists of America, in a great moment of history, adopted a position which if successful would have extended militarism in all lands beyond the dreams even of Bernhardi. Mr. Hillquit and I voted against

APPENDIX

the proposed campaign in favor of an embargo, Messrs. Berger and Work voting on the other side, the result being a tie. But the mischief had already been done; the address to the President had been given wide publicity in the press and the agitation for an embargo was in full swing. It should be said that Hillquit explained in a subsequent letter to the National Secretary that he voted against the motion to agitate in favor of an embargo *at that time*, but that he believed in the principle of an embargo on munitions and other war supplies. "I am not opposed to the embargo," he wrote, on March 1, 1917, "but am opposed to making it the slogan and predominant feature in connection with our present protests against the threatened war." I was the only member of the National Executive Committee opposed to the embargo on principle, from first to last.

II

On February 6, 1917, the National Secretary of the party submitted to the members of the National Executive Committee the following proclamation, drafted by Morris Hillquit and revised by Berger and Work:

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

PROCLAMATION

By a mere executive decree, the President of your country has broken off diplomatic relations with the German Empire and placed the people of the United States in imminent danger of being actively drawn into the mad war of Europe.

During the last thirty months, the blackest months in the annals of human history, six million innocent men have been brutally and deliberately killed, and many more millions have been crippled and maimed for life. Whole countries have been devastated and the accumulated treasures of human industry and nature's generosity have been ruthlessly destroyed.

Europe is a dread house of mourning in which the disconsolate sobs of the widows and orphans at home mingle with the agonized groans of the wounded and dying on the battle-field.

In this savage carnival of wholesale and indiscriminate murder there was but one powerful member of the family of nations that preserved an attitude of comparative sanity—the United States of America. Removed by the vast stretch of the Atlantic Ocean from the scene of the inhuman conflict, safe in our economic self-sufficiency, and proud of our advanced and democratic institutions, we watched the self-destruction of our European brothers with bleeding hearts, eagerly waiting for the opportunity to bring them back to reason and peace, to life and happiness.

And suddenly, with little notice or warning, without the sanction or consent of the people, and without consultation with the people's chosen representatives in Congress, we are practically ordered to join in the mad dance of death and destruction and

APPENDIX

to swell the ghastly river of blood in Europe with the blood of thousands of American workers.

The Socialist Party of the United States, speaking in behalf of hundreds of thousands of its adherents, and in behalf of the working-class of this country, enters a solemn protest against this wanton attempt to draw us into the European conflict.

We are opposed to wars between nations because war is a reversion to brutal barbarism. We are opposed to the present threatened war in particular because no great war has ever been waged with less justification and on more frivolous pretexts.

The policy of unrestricted and indiscriminate submarine warfare recently announced by the German government is most ruthless and inhuman, but so is war as a whole, and so are all methods applied by both sides.

War is murder.

War is the climax of utter lawlessness and it is idle to prate about lawful or unlawful methods of warfare.

The German submarine warfare does not threaten our national integrity or independence, nor even our national dignity and honor. It was not aimed primarily at the United States, and would not affect the American people. It would strike only those parasitic classes that have been making huge profits by manufacturing instruments of death or taking away our food and selling it at exorbitant prices to the fighting armies of Europe.

The workers of the United States have no reason and no desire to shed their blood for the protection and furtherance of the unholy profits of their masters, and will not permit a lying and venal press to stampede

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

them into taking up arms to murder their brothers in Europe.

The six million men whose corpses are now rotting upon the battle-fields of Europe were mostly working-men. If the United States is drawn into war it will be the American workers whose lives will be sacrificed—an inglorious, senseless sacrifice on the altar of capitalist greed.

Workers of America, awake!

The hour is grave, the danger is imminent, silence would be fatal.

Gather the masses in meetings and demonstrations!
Speak in unmistakable tones!

Let your voice of vehement and determined protest resound from one end of the country to the other.

Send telegrams or letters to President Wilson, to the United States Senators and Congressmen. Demand that the American citizens and American ships be forbidden to enter the war zone, except at their own risk. Insist that the nation should not be plunged into war for the benefit of plundering capitalists.

Down with war!

Down with the inhuman social system that breeds wars!

Long live peace!

Long live the international solidarity of the workers of all nations!

When this document was sent to the National Executive Committee for its approval I telegraphed my vote against its adoption, and in a subsequent letter to the National Secretary expressed my views as follows:

APPENDIX

Immediately on receipt of your letter I wired that, to my regret, I could not sign the proclamation in the form submitted. This is the first available opportunity to give my reasons.

With the aim of the proclamation I am in full sympathy. There is no member of the party more anxious than I am to have America keep out of the war. Any intelligent movement to that end, which is not at the same time a betrayal of civilization and a support of German militarism, will command my hearty and unflinching support.

But I cannot give my assent to that eighth paragraph with its question-begging evasiveness and its cowardly and insincere apology for German *Schrecklichkeit*. "It is idle to prate about lawful or lawless methods of warfare," says this proposed proclamation. Such a phrase would come fittingly from a militarist. In a Socialist pronunciamento it is entirely out of place. The laws which restrict warfare, which provide for the protection of civilian non-combatants, which forbid strewing mines in the open seas to the danger of innocent non-combatants, the sinking of ships without warning, the bombardment of undefended towns, the spoliation of conquered peoples and their enslavement—such laws are a very vital and important part of civilized society.

To preserve the rights of civilians and of neutral nations from the assaults of belligerents is a great and solemn obligation specially incumbent upon Socialists. To call attention to these laws and to assert their validity is not "prating." The sneer is unworthy of a Socialist. It implies a contempt for the laws and usages of civilized society quite char-

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

acteristic of militarism at its worst, and utterly inconsistent with Socialism.

Coming on top of our failure (alone of the Socialist parties of neutral nations) to protest against the reversion to barbarism seen in the deportation and enslavement of the civilian population of conquered territories by Germany, this craven apology for Germany's studied and progressive disregard of the limitations which centuries of effort have placed upon war and its inhumanities is distressing. The proclamation reads like a speech by Chancellor von Bethmann-Hollweg!

In appealing to Comrade Legien and the German trade unions to use their influence to end the infamous assault on the rights of non-combatants and neutrals, Samuel Gompers has taken the true Socialist position. We should have appealed long since to our German and Austrian comrades, especially in behalf of the enslaved civilian population of Belgium. We should appeal to them now to use their influence to restrain the madness of their war lords.

President Wilson in severing diplomatic relations with Germany represents the best judgment of America, and of mankind. He has not declared war. If war comes it will not be, as this proclamation charges, because our capitalists have chosen to make war on frivolous pretexts, but because Germany deliberately and for her own purposes forces war with us. No great nation in all history ever manifested so much restraint and forbearance in the face of repeated unprovoked attacks and invasions of her rights as the United States has done. I hope that the restraint and forbearance will continue; that we shall not have war. But I am not willing to be a party

APPENDIX

to such a gross perversion of the facts as I find in this document.

Only a few years ago, following the outrageous persecution of the Jews in Russia, we were all of us urging the then President to sever diplomatic relations with Russia, and, later, with Rumania. Rightly, as I think, we took the position that the barbarous practices permitted or condoned by the Russian and Rumanian governments made it desirable that we should sever our relations, as the one effective way open to us of rebuking the barbarism and upholding civilized rights, usages, and institutions. We did not then indulge in crude sophistries and say that we ought not to protest against Russian *pogroms*, because all race prejudice is bad and there are other nations, including our own, which are guilty of anti-Semitism. We fearlessly proclaimed then that severance of diplomatic relations with the governments guilty of such reversions was a democratic nation's duty and right. It is not less so to-day.

In line with the foregoing, I would agree to the course of action outlined in next to the last paragraph, provided some appeal to the Socialists of Germany and Austria to use their influence on the side of humanity were added, and the eighth paragraph reconstructed in such a manner as will place before the American people the fact that we stand squarely and bravely for civilization, against barbarism; that we are not pro-Teuton or pro-Ally, but pro-human and pro-Socialist.

So changed, I will gladly sign the proclamation. In its present form I cannot do so without sacrificing on the altar of expediency my profoundest convictions.

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

These documents show how wide was the gulf which separated me from my colleagues on the National Executive Committee from the beginning of the war. They show, too, how closely the reasoning of the majority copied that of the Chancelleries of the Central Empires.

II

THE NATIONAL CONVENTION OF THE PARTY ACTS

EARLY in March, 1917, when it became evident that war was well-nigh inevitable, the majority members of the National Executive Committee of the Socialist Party decided to call a special convention, to be held early in April. They had no constitutional right to do this, but it was felt that the special circumstances justified the departure from strict legal form. It was hoped that the special Emergency Convention, as it was called, could be held before the question whether we should go to war was finally decided, but when the convention met in St. Louis, on April 7th, Congress had already acted and declared that Germany's acts constituted war upon this country, which state we must duly recognize. Thus we were actually at war with the German Empire when the convention assembled.

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

The members of the convention, numbering nearly two hundred, elected a Committee on War and Militarism, consisting of fifteen members, the writer being one of the fifteen. That committee met for two days and as a result of its deliberations three separate reports were made to the convention. The first, the Majority Report, was signed by eleven of the fifteen members. The second was signed by three members and was so like the Majority Report in substance that it was hard to understand why its authors took the trouble to make a separate report at all. The third report was signed by only one member of the committee, the present writer.

The Majority Report of the Committee on War and Militarism received 140 votes in the convention and became, therefore, the Majority Report of the convention. No single official document in the history of American Socialism has been more widely discussed, and none is so inaccessible to the average reader. Its full text reads:

MAJORITY REPORT¹

The Socialist Party of the United States in the present grave crisis solemnly reaffirms its allegiance

¹ Italics in this and following documents mine.—J. S.

APPENDIX

to the principle of internationalism and working-class solidarity the world over, and proclaims *its unalterable opposition to the war just declared by the Government of the United States.*

Modern wars as a rule have been caused by the commercial and financial rivalry and intrigues of the capitalist interests in the different countries. Whether they have been frankly waged as wars of aggression or have been hypocritically represented as wars of "defense," they have always been made by the classes and fought by the masses. Wars bring wealth and power to the ruling classes, and suffering, death, and demoralization to the workers.

They breed a sinister spirit of passion, unreason, race hatred, and false patriotism. They obscure the struggles of the workers for life, liberty, and social justice. They tend to sever the vital bonds of solidarity between them and their brothers in other countries, to destroy their organizations, and to curtail their civic and political rights and liberties.

The Socialist Party of the United States is unalterably opposed to the system of exploitation and class rule, which is upheld and strengthened by military power and sham national patriotism. We, therefore, *call upon the workers of all countries to refuse support to their governments in their wars.* The wars of the contending groups of capitalists are not the concern of the workers. *The only struggle* which would justify the workers in taking up arms is the great struggle of the working-class of the world to free itself from economic exploitation and political oppression, *and we particularly warn the workers against the snare and delusion of so-called defensive warfare.* As against the false doctrine of national patriotism we uphold the

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

ideal of international working-class solidarity. In support of capitalism, we will not willingly give a single life or a single dollar; in support of the struggle of the workers for freedom, we pledge our all.

The mad orgy of death and destruction which is now convulsing unfortunate Europe was caused by the conflict of capitalist interests in the European countries.

In each of these countries the workers were oppressed and exploited. They produced enormous wealth, but the bulk of it was withheld from them by the owners of the industries. The workers were thus deprived of the means to repurchase the wealth which they themselves had created.

The capitalist class of each country was forced to look for foreign markets to dispose of the accumulated "surplus" wealth. The huge profits made by the capitalists could no longer be profitably reinvested in their own countries, hence they were driven to look for foreign fields of investment. The geographical boundaries of each modern capitalist country thus became too narrow for the industrial and commercial operations of its capitalist class.

The efforts of the capitalists of all leading nations were therefore centered upon the domination of the world markets. Imperialism became the dominant note in the politics of Europe. The acquisition of colonial possessions and the extension of spheres of commercial and political influence became the object of diplomatic intrigues and the cause of constant clashes between nations.

The acute competition between the capitalist powers of the earth, their jealousies and distrusts of one another and the fear of the rising power of the work-

APPENDIX

ing-class *forced each of them to arm to the teeth*. This led to the mad rivalry of armament, which, years before the outbreak of the present war, had turned the leading countries of Europe into armed camps with standing armies of many millions, drilled and equipped for war in times of "peace."

Capitalism, imperialism, and militarism had thus laid the foundation of an inevitable general conflict in Europe. The ghastly war in Europe was not caused by an accidental event, *nor by the policy or institutions of any single nation*. It was the logical outcome of the competitive capitalist system.

The six million men of all countries and races who have been ruthlessly slain in the first thirty months of this war, the millions of others who have been crippled and maimed, the vast treasures of wealth that have been destroyed, the untold misery and sufferings of Europe, have not been sacrifices exacted in a struggle for principles or ideals, but wanton offerings upon the altar of private profit.

The forces of capitalism which have led to the war in Europe are even more hideously transparent in the war recently provoked by the ruling class of this country.

When Belgium was invaded, the government enjoined upon the people of this country the duty of remaining neutral, thus clearly demonstrating that the "dictates of humanity," and the fate of small nations and of democratic institutions were matters that did not concern it. But when our enormous war traffic was seriously threatened our government calls¹ upon us to rally to the "defense of democracy and civilization."

Our entrance into the European war was instigated

¹ *Sic.*

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

by the predatory capitalists in the United States who boast of the enormous profit of seven billion dollars from the manufacture and sale of munitions and war supplies and from the exportation of American food-stuffs and other necessities. They are also deeply interested in the continuance of the war and the success of the Allied arms through other commercial ties. It is the same interests which strive for imperialistic domination of the Western Hemisphere.

The war of the United States against Germany cannot be justified even on the plea that it is a war in defense of American rights or American "honor." Ruthless as the unrestricted submarine warfare was and is, it is not an invasion of the rights of the American people, as such, but only an interference with the opportunity of certain groups of American capitalists to coin cold profits out of the blood and sufferings of our fellow-men in the warring countries of Europe.

It is not a war against the militarist régime of the Central Powers. Militarism can never be abolished by militarism.

It is not a war to advance the cause of democracy in Europe. Democracy can never be imposed upon any country by a foreign power by force of arms.

It is cant and hypocrisy to say that the war is not directed against the German people, but against the Imperial Government of Germany. If we send an armed force to the battle-fields of Europe, its cannon will mow down the masses of the German people and not the Imperial German Government.

Our entrance into the European conflict at this time will serve only to multiply the horrors of the war, to increase the toll of death and destruction and to prolong the fiendish slaughter. It will bring

APPENDIX

death, suffering, and destitution to the people of the United States and particularly to the working-class. It will give the powers of reaction in this country the pretext for an attempt to throttle our rights and to crush our democratic institutions, and to fasten upon this country a permanent militarism.

The working-class of the United States has no quarrel with the working-class of Germany or of any other country. The people of the United States have no quarrel with the people of Germany or any other country. The American people did not want and do not want this war. They have not been consulted about the war and have had no part in declaring war. They have been plunged into this war by the trickery and treachery of the ruling class of the country through its representatives in the National Administration and National Congress, its demagogic agitators, its subsidized press, and other servile instruments of public expression.

We brand the declaration of war by our government as a crime against the people of the United States and against the nations of the world.

In all modern history there has been no war more unjustifiable than the war in which we are about to engage.

No greater dishonor has ever been forced upon a people than that which the capitalist class is forcing upon this nation against its will.

In harmony with these principles the Socialist Party emphatically rejects the proposal that in time of war the workers should suspend their struggle for better conditions. On the contrary, the acute situation created by war calls for an even more vigorous prosecution of the class struggle, and we recommend

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

to the workers and pledge ourselves to the following course of action:

1. Continuous, active, and public opposition to the war, through demonstrations, mass petitions, and all other means within our power.

2. Unyielding opposition to all proposed legislation for military *or industrial* conscription. Should such conscription be forced upon the people, we pledge ourselves to continuous efforts for the repeal of such laws *and to support of all mass movements in opposition to conscription*. We pledge ourselves to oppose with all our strength any attempt to raise money for the payment of war expense by taxing the necessities of life or issuing bonds which will put the burden upon future generations. We demand that the capitalist class, which is responsible for the war, pay its cost. Let those who kindled the fire furnish the fuel.

3. Vigorous resistance to all reactionary measures, such as censorship of press and mails, restriction of the rights of free speech, assemblage, and organization, *or compulsory arbitration and limitation of the right to strike*.

4. Consistent propaganda against military training and militaristic teaching in the public schools.

5. Extension of the campaign of education among the workers to organize them into strong, class-conscious, and closely unified political and industrial organizations, to enable them by concerted and harmonious mass action to shorten this war and to establish lasting peace.

6. Widespread educational propaganda to enlighten the masses as to the true relation between capitalism and war, and to rouse and organize them for action,

APPENDIX

not only against present war evils, but for the prevention of future wars and for the destruction of the causes of war.

7. To protect the masses of the American people from the pressing danger of starvation which the war in Europe has brought upon them, and which the entry of the United States has already accentuated, we demand—

(a) The restriction of food exports so long as the present shortage continues, the fixing of maximum prices and whatever measures may be necessary to prevent the food speculators from holding back the supplies now in their hands;

(b) The socialization and democratic management of the great industries concerned with the production, transportation, storage, and the marketing of food and other necessities of life;

(c) The socialization and democratic management of all land and other natural resources now held out of use for monopolistic or speculative profit.

These measures are presented as means of protecting the workers against the evil results of the present war. The danger of the recurrence of war will exist as long as the capitalist system of industry remains in existence. The end of wars will come with the establishment of socialized industry and industrial democracy the world over. The Socialist Party calls upon all the workers to join in its struggle to reach this goal, and thus bring into the world a new society in which peace, fraternity, and human brotherhood will be the dominant ideals.

In the Committee on War and Militarism, before any attempt was made to formulate

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

a resolution, each member was called upon to state his general position. Several of the members took the position that Socialism was wholly inconsistent with loyalty to any nation, in any circumstances, so long as the capitalist system of industry prevails. At least six members expressed themselves as being utterly opposed to any action by the workers in defense of the nation: "The workers have no country; it is the capitalists' country," "Whether they are governed by Czar Nicholas or Woodrow Wilson, or whether the government is republican or monarchical, is a matter of complete indifference to the class-conscious worker," "Suppose we were invaded by Germany or by Mexico, why should we care? Instead of fighting them, we should welcome the invaders as our brothers"—these statements which I wrote down at the time fairly indicate the point of view of the most influential element in the committee. Later, when the resolutions were being drafted, the spokesmen of this group fought for hours against the use of such phrases as "our government," consistently adhering to their theory that the working-class can have no country and no government. They opposed the inclusion in the program of action specific

APPENDIX

collectivist measures, on the ground that such measures would, if adopted, "help the capitalists to win the war." They opposed the inclusion of a proposal to work for the humanitarian treatment of prisoners and the observance of lawful and humane methods of war, on the ground that such action would "make war more tolerable."

Against this position I contended that national defense was compatible with the highest internationalism; that the defense of the nation might be the highest duty of the Socialist; that, so far from it being a matter of indifference to the working-class whether the government was republican or monarchical, it was the essence of Socialism that monarchical government must be destroyed wherever it exists and republican government established; that failure to defend the nation in the event of an invasion by armed legions would be a dastardly betrayal of civilization. I stated at some length my reasons for believing that in the present war the defeat of the Central Empires is necessary for the well-being of the proletariat of all lands, even of Germany and Austria. At some length, too, I sketched what I considered to be a rational Socialist policy to be pursued in the circumstances.

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

It was not my intention to make a separate report to the convention. I was quite satisfied to be recorded as against the majority view. But Victor L. Berger, of Milwaukee, addressing the committee, warmly supported my theoretical position and said that he wanted my statement of Socialist principles to be accepted as his also. He did not agree with my application of those principles in the present case, however, and radically disagreed with the program of action I had outlined. He wanted, he said, the report of the committee to be in two parts—my statement of fundamental Socialist principles and the immediate policy of Hillquit and his associates. He denounced the dominant element of the committee as “crazy Anarchists” and declared that he would “never stand for the doctrine that the workers have no country to defend.” Nevertheless, he later appended his signature to the Majority Report!

Partly as a result of Berger's hearty support in the committee of my fundamental position, and partly in response to pressure from outside—comrades from various parts of the country having urged me to make a fight against the destructive policies which had so nearly wrecked the party—I decided

APPENDIX

to present a separate report, though I had not the slightest idea that it would be accepted. The report follows:

A MINORITY REPORT

The Congress of the United States has declared that a series of illegal acts on the part of the German government constitute war against this nation. We are now actually at war with Germany and her allies. The great struggle which for nearly three years has been waged between the principal European nations, a war of unparalleled magnitude and frightfulness, has at last drawn in this Republic, until now the greatest of neutral nations.

The Socialist Party is compelled now to state, with greater definiteness and precision than has been done heretofore, the position of the party toward the war and upon the problems which the war inevitably presents.

In the presence of this dire calamity we proclaim our unfaltering allegiance to the principle of internationalism. We have no quarrel with the people of Germany or of any other nation.

Our guiding principle in all that concerns our relations to the people of other lands is internationalism. We are internationalists and anti-militarists.

But internationalism does not mean for us anti-nationalism. Nor has it anything whatever to do with the vague doctrine of world-organization, for which no accurately descriptive name exists, symbolized by the picturesque ceremony of flag-burning. This much-exploited ceremonial was a crude attempt to symbolize a conception of a nationless world.

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

We repudiate the claim made by some that loyalty to this nation is inconsistent with true internationalism. Those who say that Socialism involves the view that the working-class has no nation to call its own, that all nations are alike, that there is nothing to choose between a militarist autocracy and a democratic republic, do not preach Socialist internationalism, but pernicious reactionary nonsense.

To say that there is no difference between governments is at once demagogic and untrue. Between the old Russian régime and the new is a vast difference, even though the new régime is not a fully developed Socialist republic. Not to have a choice between them is to be a political imbecile rather than a social revolutionist.

Internationalism presupposes nationalism. It is the interrelation of nations. The maintenance of national integrity and independence is an essential condition of inter-nationalism. This principle has never in the past been seriously questioned in our movement. It has been the guiding principle of our policies in the Socialist international.

Upon that basis we have always defended the small nationalities and supported their struggles for independence. We have championed Ireland's struggle for national independence; we protested against the denationalization of Poland and aided the Poles in all their struggles and revolutions; we supported the Finns in their resistance to Russian despotism; we vigorously protested against the destruction of the national independence of Bosnia, Herzegovina, and Bohemia. Our international policy has been uniformly consistent with this record.

From this point of view, the wanton invasion of Belgium early in this war was a crime against Socialist

APPENDIX

principles of fundamental importance. It was, furthermore, a blow at international law and good faith, the basis of whatever internationalism in world organization yet exists.

As internationalists we unequivocally assert the right of nations to defend themselves, their institutions and rights.

As a corollary to that statement, we assert the right of Socialists to participate in such defense. Marx, Engels, Bebel, Liebknecht, and practically all the great founders and teachers of our movement have taught this.

We do not mean that Socialists *must* defend their nation in all circumstances. We have no tolerance for the false patriotism which cries, "My country, right or wrong!" nor for the equally false attitude that Socialists owe no loyalty to their nation, even when its cause is right and just.

In some circumstances it might be a Socialist duty to defend some other nation against one's own. *We believe it was clearly the duty of the Social Democrats of Germany to defend Belgium's sovereignty against their own government's brutal and lawless assault.*

That nations exist is a fact. That they will long endure is certain. It may be that at some remote time there will be no separate nations. With that we are not concerned here and now. Our present interest lies in promoting good-will and understanding among nations. We aim to develop in each nation friendship and respect for all other nations and a scrupulous regard for their rights. To bring about a federation of independent and free nations is the Socialist ideal.

We accept the fine declaration of the martyred

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

Jean Jaurès that a petty nationalism leads away from internationalism, while a profound nationalism leads to internationalism; a petty internationalism leads away from nationalism, while a profound internationalism leads to a profound nationalism.

The theory of national rights which we have outlined leads to the question of the means of national defense. Admit the right of a nation to defend itself, and the right of Socialists to join in that defense, and it follows that we must admit the right of Socialists to create the means of national defense. National defense with broomsticks for armaments is impossible.

To bind the representatives of our party not to vote for any kind of defensive armaments, regardless of existing circumstances, and to provide rules for expelling a representative of the party who votes for such armaments, no matter what the conditions, is in direct opposition to Socialist internationalism, and can only be explained as a surrender to a shoddy pacifist philosophy quite distinct from and unrelated to Socialism.

This is not a concession to militarism, by which we mean the organization of the human and material resources of a nation primarily to serve military purposes. A defensive system of armament is not necessarily militaristic.

This principle has been fully approved by our international Socialist congresses, as, for example, at the congresses of Stuttgart and Copenhagen. Acceptance of it does not commit us to any particular plan of military or naval preparedness which has been or may be proposed.

We unequivocally believe in universal disarmament as the central feature of the Socialist program

APPENDIX

on this question. But this does not mean that we believe that democratic nations should disarm themselves, even when surrounded by armed autocracies. Such a course would be suicidal and worse. It would be retrogressive.

If a Socialist republic should result from the recent revolution in Russia, and the autocratic governments of Central Europe should continue to exist, the democracy of Russia would assuredly have to be prepared to defend itself. Failing that, it would soon be destroyed.

Militarism menaces democracy in two ways; within a nation it imperils democracy in that nation; outside the nation militarism is, to a defenseless people, an equally serious menace, not only to democracy, but to national life itself.

As Socialists, we are in general against war and in favor of peace. But we are not peace-at-any-price pacifists. We reject the doctrine of non-resistance, so called, as contrary to Socialism and to sound morality. From the days of Marx and Engels our movement has stood for peace, because peace is normally to the interest of the working-class movement and to the development of Socialism. But Marx and Engels clearly showed, on many occasions, that wars might, in certain circumstances, be defended and even advocated on the ground that the interest of the working-class movement and the development of Socialism would be furthered thereby.

It is worthy of note at this time that Marx opposed the pacifists of 1853 with great vigor, and waged an active propaganda to force England to make war on Russia. Marx was in favor of that war because he believed that it would stimulate political and eco-

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

nomic progress and the interests of the working-class.

The present war, which broke out in the summer of 1914, had its origin in the economic conditions and the political institutions and national ideals prevailing in Europe. Germany began the war, and rejected all attempts at arbitration, because of the peculiar conjunction of economic conditions and political institutions and national ideals characteristic of her national life.

The die for war was cast by the triple powers dominating Germany—the autocratic monarchy, inspired by a great imperialistic vision, the great military class, and that section of the capitalist class closely associated with militarism.

When this relentless triumvirate spurned the means of international arbitration which the Entente nations proposed, and followed that by the invasion of Belgium and the repudiation of all international agreements and organization, the attitude which Socialists must take toward it was determined for us. Whatever the avowed object of the war, or the real aim on either side, the Central Empires had made themselves the particular enemies of democratic Socialism. From that point onward it was quite evident that the defeat of the Central Empires would be conducive to civilization in general and international Socialism in particular.

Throughout the war Germany has acted with brutal lawlessness and inhumanity, not only against her enemies, but also against peaceful and law-abiding neutral nations, including our own.

All sane people, even Germans themselves, must acknowledge that the ruthless methods of warfare

APPENDIX

adopted by the German government are indefensible and intolerable. With wanton disregard of all human rights in the way of its military plans, Germany has tried to enthrone barbarism over civilization.

The provocation to war, which this nation has borne with a patience and forbearance which will glow brightly in our history, has been great indeed. No nation with power to defend itself has, in modern times, endured so much.

Recognizing this most clearly, we Socialists have, nevertheless, hoped that the nation might find it possible to stay out of the war. We recognize the great peril of active participation in the war to our national life. To the last moment we opposed war against Germany by this nation. More than that, even now we urge that instead of raising a large army to be sent to Europe, the government should mobilize the economic resources of the nation, and place the greatest possible amount of munitions and food supplies at the disposal of France and Belgium.

In this manner, we believe, the largest possible contribution to the defeat of Germany would be made, while, at the same time, our own nation would be saved from much bitter suffering, from reaction and military rule over our civil life during the war, and from the heavy burden of a great military system.

We do not believe that the entrance of the United States into the war at this late hour is wholly due to a determination to fight for democracy, or for the independence of peoples from autocratic rule. Our capitalist class has shown too great an interest in the war to make such a belief tenable.

But even if it is conceded that the war of the United States against Germany has been brought on by the

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

capitalists of this nation in their own interests, we must still desire that in the struggle this nation shall be victorious. Regardless of the capitalist motives involved, it is a fact that on one side are ranged the greatest autocracies in the world, the most powerful reactionary nations, while on the other side are ranged the most progressive and democratic nations in the world. To this fact we cannot be indifferent.

We do not, as Socialists, subscribe to the doctrine that once war has been declared in spite of our opposition, we must cease all opposition to it. We do say, however, that when, as in the present case, it is clear that the victory of one side as against the other would promote freedom and democracy, an intelligent application of Socialist principles to the existing situation leads inevitably to the conclusion that the interest of our movement requires the victory of that side.

To profess indifference to the *result* of the war now being waged, to desire either that the war end in a draw or in the defeat of the Entente powers with which this nation is allied, is treachery to the principles of international Socialism.

Furthermore, it is treachery to the democratic principles and institutions of America. The identification of Socialism with this disloyalty to the essential principles of Americanism would destroy every hope of ever winning the great masses of the American people to our cause. We assert that Socialism is not disloyal to the interests of this nation.

Now that the war is an accomplished fact, for the reasons stated we hold that it is our Socialist duty to make whatever sacrifices may be necessary to

APPENDIX

enable our nation and its Allies to win the war as speedily as possible.

In accordance with this statement of the principles which we believe must guide the action of Socialists at this time, we recommend to our members and sympathizers the following program of action:

Active agitation against the suppression of free speech and other popular rights, and to all the reactionary movements which arise in war-time.

Agitation in favor of submitting the question of universal compulsory military service to a popular referendum vote of all citizens.

The creation of public opinion to enforce the demand that conscription of wealth accompany any conscription of men for military service.

Demand that for the purpose of paying for the war the United States government shall sequester all incomes in excess of \$5,000 a year.

Co-operation with the labor unions and other working-class organizations in an organized effort to secure the popular democratic control of all governing bodies instituted for the war, and the representation of the labor unions in the direction of all industries which are or may be placed under government control.

Limitation of profits in all private industrial and commercial enterprises.

Government ownership of railroads, mines, and all industries upon which the efficient prosecution of the war and the well-being of the civil population depend.

Active efforts to promote the restoration of the Socialist International, especially to establish friendly

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

intercourse with our comrades in enemy countries, with a view to co-operation in efforts to bring about a peace which will be to the interest of the international Socialist movement.

Special activity to promote humane treatment of prisoners of war and interned aliens, to oppose all violations of international law by this nation, and to limit the area and the terrors of war in all possible ways.

Energetic action, through political and economic organization, to raise the income of the working-class to meet the almost inevitable increase in the cost of the necessities of life.

I did not expect the convention to accord much support to such a statement of principles, and was in nowise disappointed or surprised when it received only five votes. Had my intention been merely to defeat the Majority Report I should have adopted quite different tactics and offered a report which avoided all discussion of fundamental principles. After the convention had voted for the Majority Report by an overwhelming vote, at the request of a number of delegates who were alarmed by what had been done, including some who had voted for the Majority Report, I prepared the following Declaration on War Policy, which, while not acted on by the convention, under the party rules could be submitted to the party mem-

APPENDIX

bership referendum if signed by a sufficient number of delegates to the convention. It bore the signatures of fifty-two delegates:

DECLARATION OF WAR POLICY

Congress has declared that a state of war exists between this nation and Germany. War between the two nations is a fact.

We opposed the entrance of this Republic into the war, but we failed. The political and economic organizations of the working-class were not strong enough to do more than protest.

Having failed to prevent the war by our agitation, we can only recognize it as a fact and try to force upon the government, through pressure of public opinion, a constructive program.

Our aim now must be to minimize the suffering and misery which the war will bring to our people, to protect our rights and liberties against reactionary encroachments, and to promote an early peace upon a democratic basis, advantageous to the international working-class.

Furthermore, we must seize the opportunity presented by war conditions to advance our program of democratic collectivism. Every one of the other belligerent nations has discovered through the war that capitalism is inherently inefficient. To secure a maximum of efficiency, whether for military or civil needs, it has been found necessary to abandon the essential principle of capitalist industry. The warring nations have had to give up the organization and operation of industry and the primary economic

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

functions for profit, and to adopt the Socialist principle of production for use. Thus the war has demonstrated the superior efficiency of collective organization and operation of industry.

Guided by this experience, we would so reorganize our economic system as to secure for our permanent domestic needs the greatest possible results from the proper utilization of our national resources.

In furtherance of these aims, we propose the following

WAR PROGRAM

1. We propose that the Socialist Party shall establish communication with the Socialists within the enemy nations, to the end that peace may be secured upon democratic terms at the earliest possible moment.

2. We demand that there be no interference with freedom of speech, freedom of the press, and freedom of assemblage.

3. We demand that dealings between the government and the workers in all of the industries and services taken over and operated by the government shall be conducted through their organizations, with due regard for the right of organization of those not yet organized.

4. We demand that conscription, if it come at all, shall begin with wealth. All annual incomes in excess of \$5,000 should be taken by the government and used to pay the current expenses of the war. If it is just to conscript a human being, it is just to conscript wealth. Money is not so sacred as human life.

APPENDIX

5. We demand that there shall be no conscription of men until the American people shall have given the right to vote upon it. Under the British Empire the people of Australia were permitted to decide by ballot whether they should be conscripted. We demand for the American people the same right.

6. We demand that the government seize and operate for the benefit of the whole people the great industries concerned with production, transportation, storage, and marketing of the food and other necessities of the people.

7. We demand that the government seize all suitable vacant land, and have the same cultivated for the purpose of furnishing food supplies for the national use.

8. We demand that the government take over and operate all land and water transport facilities; all water powers and irrigation plants; mines, forests, and oil-fields, and all industrial monopolies; and that this be done at once, before the nation shall suffer calamity from the failure of their capitalist direction and management under war pressure.

In the referendum this declaration was submitted as a substitute for the Majority Report, but it was overwhelmingly defeated. As time went on, however, it became evident that the leaders of the party were not ready to live up to the policy they had foisted on the party. In practice they followed the lines laid down in the rejected Declaration on War Policy, and the party

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

membership quietly accepted the situation. A notable example of this is the case of the Socialist mayor of Milwaukee. Mayor Hoan openly violated the war policy and told the party committee that he could not comply with that party and obey the Constitution and laws of the United States. It is a remarkable fact that the party committee took the mayor's view. From a signed statement issued by Mayor Hoan on January 4, 1918, I quote the following passages:

"Notwithstanding the fact that I opposed this country going to war, and never have approved it, I voted against the St. Louis Majority Report, and for the Minority Report. I found when it was adopted that as mayor there was not only no way of complying, but that it was impossible to obey some of its requirements and demands.

"I reported my conclusions to the Milwaukee County Central Committee, *which agreed with me*. I stated to them that there were but two possible courses to pursue—namely, *either to resign as mayor or to comply with the laws of the United States, its Constitution and the government's requests in connection with carrying on the war*. I offered to comply with whichever of these two courses it might choose. *It immediately*

APPENDIX

agreed with me that I could not obey these requirements and demands of the St. Louis report, and unanimously voted that I execute and carry out the laws of the United States, the Constitution and every order and request of the government in connection with carrying on the war."—*Milwaukee Journal*, January 4, 1918.

III

THE "MAJORITY REPORT"—A CRITICISM ¹

I

LIKE my good friend, Morris Hillquit, I can truthfully say that it has been my good fortune to attend and take part in many Socialist conventions, but that the Emergency Convention held in St. Louis will, I believe, "always hold a unique place in my memory." But I shall accord it that distinction for reasons quite different from those which inspire Comrade Hillquit.

I shall always remember that rump convention, illegally constituted (many of its delegates being either self-elected or the choice of party officials, in nowise representative of the membership), as the most tragic event in the history of the Socialist

¹ From the *New York Call*.

APPENDIX

Party. I shall remember it as the occasion when the Socialist Party missed its supreme opportunity.

I shall remember it as the gathering of a sect which failed to meet not only the opportunities presented by the national crisis, but every other need and opportunity arising out of American economic and political development.

For it was not only in the war resolution adopted that the Emergency Convention proved itself to be entirely out of touch with American life and American needs, and, therefore, utterly incompetent to build an American Socialist movement. The same fact was apparent throughout. It was just as clearly apparent in the discussions on the party constitution. The few comrades who realized something of the needs of the party were not listened to. In vain did they point out the fact—all too obvious, one would think—that we have not yet developed a party, but only a petty sect. In vain did they plead for a general unshackling of the Socialist workers to the end that they might be free to work for Socialism. The response of the convention was to tighten the shackles a bit more.

Confronted by the challenge of a new force

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

in the shape of the Non-Partisan League movement, a growing force in not less than a dozen states, the convention acted the part of the ostrich, and buried its head in the sand. It had not the elementary common sense to invite the delegates from the states in which the new movement is a force to give their experience and advice. Upon the greatest agrarian radical movement of our time the farmer delegates could not get a hearing. Those who knew nothing of the new movement nor of conditions in the states where it has made its way, city dwellers, monopolized the discussion.

The result was the enactment of a resolution which, as the State Secretary of Kansas said to me, means that the Socialist Party cannot live in Kansas. Delegates from the Dakotas, from Oklahoma and other states, expressed themselves to the same general effect.

We cannot understand the significance of the declaration on war policy adopted by the convention unless we take into account its general attitude toward the problems of American life to-day. Not only by the resolution on war, but by its entire work, the convention revealed its complete failure to relate its Socialist visions and theories to American life.

APPENDIX

There are many of us in the party who had looked forward to the holding of a regular convention in September of this year. It was our hope that by that time it would be possible to get a general recognition of the fact that our party machinery is obsolete, and to bring about the creation of a new form of organization, American in its character. We knew that the Socialist Party is held in lamentable disrepute all over the country, especially by the working-class. We knew that, with hardly an exception, the party is weaker in all our large centers than it was ten years ago. And this is not due to the war. Before the war began, or was believed possible, this decadence was manifest.

From the point of view of those who realized these conditions and hoped for change, the St. Louis convention was a disaster. It put an end to all hopes of change. We must go on as before, and while Socialism rapidly increases its hold upon the minds and consciences of the American people, the Socialist Party must decline and wilt. We must still retain our complex, antiquated, un-American machinery, and be like the man who owns a motor-car, but never has a chance to ride in it because

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

he must spend all his time underneath "fixing" it.

II

Comrade Hillquit is quite correct in saying that the important matters of revising the party platform and the constitution, and of outlining methods of organization and propaganda, received "scant attention" at the convention. The stenographic report of the discussions, if it is ever published, will abundantly verify that statement. It will show that the convention paid almost equally "scant attention" to the real issues involved in the resolution on war policy. Stump speeches against war, avowals of militant class-consciousness, wild denunciations of the makers of war, and so on, were common enough. There was very little serious discussion of principles.

The result is a resolution, the Majority Report, which the membership of the party will no doubt vote down by an overwhelming majority,¹ in favor of the alternate report submitted by more than a quarter of the delegates to the convention.

I have too much respect for the intelligence

¹ It was actually adopted by a large majority.

APPENDIX

of the party membership to believe that it will approve the Majority Report, which is ambiguous and evasive where definiteness is most needed; unsound in theory, especially in its treatment of the causes of the war; inaccurate and misleading in its statements upon matters of fact; out of harmony with Socialist principles; ethically reprehensible and demagogic in the character of its appeal.

A formidable indictment, truly. If the space were at my disposal, I feel quite certain that I could adequately sustain each and every one of its counts.

The ambiguity and evasiveness of language are not accidental. As I pointed out at the convention, when Victor L. Berger, a strong nationalist, who believes in the right and duty of Socialists to defend their nation and advocates military preparedness to that end, signs a declaration on the subject of war policy with those who declare that the workers have no nation, that they have no choice to make between democracy and autocracy, and that they would not favor any attempt to repel any invasion of this country, no matter by whom attempted, you can be quite certain that the words of their agreement have been skilfully woven to evade the issue between them, or trickily

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

designed to deceive the one party or the other.

The Majority Report attempted a two-fold task—to formulate a theoretical exposition of Socialist principles as they relate to war and kindred subjects, and a definite program of action to be adopted in the existing circumstances. In the light of that two-fold purpose, which Comrade Hillquit acknowledges, it is pertinent to inquire how, if at all, the report answers those many perplexing questions which have beset our minds for the past three years. Are we peace-at-any-price pacifists? Would we under any conditions fight to defend the nation from invasion? Were our Belgian comrades wrong in joining with all other Belgians in defense of their national sovereignty?

The Majority Report makes no attempt to set forth a carefully reasoned statement of Socialist principles governing these important and vital questions. It begs the issue in a shameless manner. Declaring that we are opposed to "the system of exploitation and class rule," it proceeds:

"We, therefore, call upon the workers of all countries to refuse support to their governments in their wars." If this passage means anything at all, it means that the Socialist

APPENDIX

Party of the United States would call upon the workers of Belgium to "refuse support to their government"—a policy which would make them allies of the most diabolical military despotism in history. It means, if it means anything, that in the not impossible event of an attempt by this or some other nation to subjugate Mexico, we, the Socialist Party, would call upon the Mexican workers to "refuse support to their government." If this country should be invaded by Japan or any other nation, without any justification, we would, according to this crude, anarchistic, and anti-Socialist doctrine, call upon the workers of this country to play the game of the enemy by refusing their support to the government in its attempts to repel the invader. Precious little chance would there be of our call being heeded!

Now I know perfectly well that some of those who signed the Majority Report absolutely and unreservedly reject the doctrine contained in the passage quoted—the doctrine, bear in mind, that is fundamental to the whole report. Victor L. Berger, for example, does not accept it. He cannot.

His signature to the report was hardly dry when he told me that he believed as strongly as ever in "the right and duty of national

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

self-defense," and in measures for such defense. He told the Committee on War and Militarism that he agreed fully with my views on the relation of nationalism to internationalism and on the right and duty of nations to defend themselves. He stigmatized the very views which are the fundamental basis of the Majority Report as anarchistic and contrary to Socialist principles. Other members of the committee expressed similar views.

Upon what grounds of Socialist theory is this declaration in the report based? The answer to this question is contained in these words: "The only struggle which would justify the workers in taking up arms is the great struggle of the working-class of the world to free itself from economic exploitation and political oppression."

At first blush this seems to be the old Socialist doctrine—the application of the class-struggle theory to war. In point of fact, it is a radical departure from the accepted Socialist doctrine. It is based, not upon the class-struggle theory, but upon a fantastic perversion of that theory. The words, "and political oppression," make the statement quoted ambiguous and capable of interpretation utterly at variance with the

APPENDIX

spirit and letter of the resolution. Belgian workers, struggling to resist German invaders, and Serbian workers, struggling against Austrian tyranny, would be justified by a rational interpretation of these words, for they were and are struggling against "political oppression." That same interpretation would justify American workers joining in the struggle against any invader. These words apparently made it possible for Berger and others to sign the declaration, which, without such an interpretation of the language employed, they could not honestly do.

But we may be certain that any such interpretation will be hotly contested and vigorously denied by the majority of those responsible for the report. The words I have quoted are followed by these: "*We particularly warn the workers against the snare and delusion of defensive warfare.*" Clearly, what the authors of the report believe and sought to convey is that no struggle except that between the wage-workers of a nation or group of nations can ever merit the active support of the workers. Here we have the old, oft-exploded fallacy that the workers and the capitalist class can have no common interest. It is not true. Belgian workers

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

and Belgian capitalists have a common interest in gaining their national independence from German oppression. Finnish workers and Finnish capitalists rightly made common cause to overthrow Czarism in Finland and gain constitutional rights. Bohemians of all classes have united in the struggle for national independence and will again in the future. Even the recent revolution in Russia proved that the workers and the greater part of the capitalist class had a common interest.

If this resolution is a correct statement of Socialist principles, we must condemn the action of the Belgian working-class, the Finnish working-class, the Russian working-class, the Bohemian working-class, and, in short, the working-class of all the nationalities now engaged in struggles to cast off foreign rule. I assert that the resolution is not a true statement of the Socialist position. It is the promulgation in the name of Socialism of a vicious and reactionary doctrine, subversive of the great struggle for freedom.

There is something pathetically puerile in the statement of the cause of the war in Europe. It was "caused by the conflict of capitalist interests in the European countries," we are told.

APPENDIX

That this is only a partial truth every reasonably well-informed student of contemporary politics knows. Even more potent than the capitalist interests (the influence of which is not questioned) were the dynastic aspirations of the monarchies of Central Europe. "Mittel Europa" has been a dynastic ideal and vision primarily. The great empire stretching from the North Sea to the Persian Gulf, inspiration of Hohenzollern and Hapsburg, was not primarily a capitalist conception. Serbia's tragic fate arose from the fact that she stood in the way of the Berlin-Bagdad railway. The influence of the autocratic monarchies and the great military classes of Germany and Austria is passed over as being of no account in summing up the causes of the outbreak of the war.

We have grown so used to offering the phrase, "It is the outcome of the capitalist system," as a sufficient explanation of all social and political phenomena that we have apparently lost the sense and spirit of open-minded investigation.

It has been wittily said that there are two schools of Socialism—the historical and the hysterical. Our resolution belongs to the latter. It proclaims that the entrance of

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

this Republic into the war was "unjustifiable," "dishonorable," "a crime against the people of the United States and against the nations of the world." This hysterical screaming is not sufficient: We are told that "*in all history there has been no war more unjustifiable than the war in which we are about to engage.*"

This is not history, but sheer jejune nonsense. One might be ever so opposed to the entrance of this nation into the war and yet retain some vestige of sanity. It is grotesquely untrue to say that there never was a more unjustifiable war. I could name off-hand a score of wars which were entered upon for less cause than the sinking of the *Lusitania* alone.

The sober fact is that no nation with power to defend itself has ever, in modern times, borne so many violations of its undoubted rights without resorting to war to protect those rights. Sensible people, not obsessed by fanatical anti-nationalism, will remember this when reading the hysterical statements I have quoted from the resolution.

The resolution pledges the party to unyielding opposition to conscription, both military and industrial. (The absence of any discrimination between the two is interest-

APPENDIX

ing!) Even when conscription has been adopted we are to continue our opposition. More than that, we are pledged to the support "*of all mass movements in opposition to conscription.*" Hillquit tells us that, "curiously enough, the phrase 'mass movements' was insisted upon by the 'conservative' members of the committee in order to make it clear that the party would not stand sponsor for any ill-considered and irresponsible outbreak of individual hotheads."

Since Hillquit tells part of the history of the plank, I may tell the rest, I suppose. The formulation was adopted in spite of the fact that one of the delegates who appeared before the committee, and made a vigorous appeal for "mass action," taunted the committee with its fear to trust "mass action," citing as an illustration what he meant by that phrase the fact that in his state a resolution had been passed that on the day conscription should be declared all Socialist Party members should be summoned at once to assemble in their respective county seats, and intimated in the clearest possible terms that they would by force of arms resist the attempt of the authorities to enforce the law. In the face of such a clear statement, by a delegate to the convention, of the nature of

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

a "mass movement" already under way, that plank in the program was adopted.

In other words, we shall, if we adopt the Majority Report, have signed a blank check and placed the entire credit of the party at the disposal of any group of Anarchists or other fanatics who see fit to initiate a riot. And we are in no position to help the victims of such movements who have relied upon our pledged support.

The Majority Report ignores the fact that, as at present constituted, the struggle is between the most autocratic nations in the world, on the one side, and the most advanced and democratic, on the other. Yet that must be a fact of cardinal importance to any efficient international Socialist movement. The Majority Report ignores completely the persistent assault by the Central Empires upon the fabric of internationalism already woven. Socialists whose anti-nationalism had not completely submerged their Socialism could not have been silent upon these matters.

The fact is, for several reasons, our party has been utterly pro-German from the beginning of the great war. For one reason and another, it has consistently advocated every policy advocated by the German government; it has repeated all the miserable

APPENDIX

evasions and excuses of that government and its apologists; it has been silent upon precisely the points upon which that government and its apologists have been silent.

In the discussion at the convention one delegate very earnestly suggested that the Minority Report which I presented would cause all the capitalists from Maine to California to grin with delight. I did not reply to that taunt with another, though the temptation to do so was strong. To a comrade on the floor of the convention I said of the Majority Report, which my critic approved, what I here repeat, that it was calculated to cause grins of delight to wreath the countenances of the two Kaisers of Germany and Austria, the Czar of Bulgaria, and the Sultan of Turkey, as well as of all the capitalists of those countries.

If we should be foolish enough to adopt the Majority Report, and become virtually the allies of the autocratic rulers named, we should effectually shut the door against every opportunity to serve the cause of Socialism in America. The American people would not listen to our propaganda again "so long as grass grows and water runs," as the old Indian phrase goes.

Those of us who oppose the Majority Re-

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

port are taunted by some of our comrades with being "Scheidemanns." The taunt comes with ill grace from the upholders of a report which Scheidemann, under orders from his imperial master, could well sign. The difference between our position and Scheidemann's is immeasurable.

Whereas, Scheidemann supports an autocratic government in a course which he knows to be contrary to Socialist principles and the dictates of humanity, we have justified the most democratic government in the world (however imperfect it may be) in defending the elemental rights of nations and the internationalism already achieved.

IV

A LETTER OF RESIGNATION

OLD BENNINGTON, VT.

May 30, 1917.

National Secretary Socialist Party,
803 West Madison St.,
Chicago, Ill.

MY DEAR GERMER,—After long and careful consideration I have decided to resign from the National Executive Committee and from the Socialist Party. Kindly communicate this fact to my colleagues, the remaining members of the committee.

I feel that I cannot take such a step without some word of explanation to the party membership. Not only are they entitled to know my reasons for withdrawing from the party and my intentions, so far as these concern the party, but a frank and full state-

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

ment from me at this time will perhaps prevent a good deal of misunderstanding in the future.

At the outset let me say that I withdraw from the party without any ill-feeling or sense of personal grievance. For you and your assistants in the national office, and for each member of the National Executive Committee, I have now, as at all times, profound respect and sincere friendship. In view of the acrimonious tone of much of the discussion which has taken place in the party recently, it seems desirable to emphasize this. In my contributions to the discussion of our war policy I have frequently and vigorously dissented from what seems to be the majority view. What I have had to say of the party and its policy I have said through our regular party channels of communication. I have not intentionally attacked any individual. If I have appeared to do this in any case, I sincerely regret the fact and beg those who appeared to be so attacked to accept this assurance that nothing was farther from my thoughts. Of all the good my life has known I count highest and best the comradeship of the men and women of the Socialist Party during these many years, and I would not in leaving the

APPENDIX

party mar that experience by any word of bitterness or reproach.

My withdrawal from the Socialist Party does not mean that I have decided to renounce Socialism. My Socialist convictions were never more intense than now. Now, as always, I am a Socialist, an inter-nationalist, and an anti-militarist. I leave the party with which I have been identified from its formation and in which I have been privileged to hold the highest positions in the gift of the members, because I am profoundly convinced that it has ceased to be an efficient instrument for the advancement of Socialism. For a long time it has been painfully clear to my mind that the Socialist Party is probably the greatest single obstacle to the progress of Socialism in America.

Of course, the immediate cause of my resignation is the fundamental difference between the majority of the National Executive Committee—and apparently the party membership—and myself upon the question of the policy to be adopted by the party in the present circumstances. But, as you and a great many other party members know, there are other serious differences, antedating the war.

From the early days of the war the Social-

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

ist Party has, in actual practice, been committed to a program essentially unneutral, un-American, and pro-German. Knowing well that every sincere pacifist who criticizes or opposes the war is bound to be dubbed "pro-German," and perhaps subject to real persecution, I have hesitated to use that term, and hasten to add that I do not think that there has been (except in a few unfortunate instances) any conscious advocacy of the German cause, as such. But it is a fact that, from the first, the party as a whole has been, with notable uniformity, on the German side. Through the utterances and actions of the National Executive Committee, the National Committee, and our press, the party has been placed in the position of favoring precisely the things desired by the German Foreign Office, and of opposing the things which the German Foreign Office opposed. We have repeated all the miserable evasions and apologies of German statesmen, and been silent upon those questions on which German interests required silence.

The truth of this can hardly be questioned. At the time when the German Foreign Secretary was demanding that the government of the United States warn its citizens from going to sea on ships bound for certain coun-

APPENDIX

tries, and withdraw its protection from those ignoring the warning, the same demand was made by our party. And when the Germans demanded that our government place an embargo on all munitions and foodstuffs, we adopted that demand as the center of our policy, notwithstanding the fact that the principle involved, if universally accepted by the nations, would, pending the arrival of the era of universal disarmament, impose upon this and every other nation a colossal military system. Later, when the severance of diplomatic relations with Germany made war imminent, our Emergency Committee repeated this Teutonic demand. Coincidentally, by the way, it was made by Mr. Jeremiah O'Leary, of New York.

Many of our leading spokesmen and journalists have made the most nauseating apologies for the betrayal of International Socialism by the German Socialist majority and have been as silent upon the outrages committed in Belgium as the most loyal subjects of the Hohenzollern dynasty could desire. Our so-called Anti-War Proclamation was, as I pointed out at the time, simply an evasive apologia for the whole German policy of "frightfulness" and international anarchy.

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

Of the resolution adopted by the Emergency Convention at St. Louis I have written at length in the party press, and spoken candidly at a party meeting in New York. It is enough to say here that the resolution is, to my mind, a betrayal of the basic principles of International Socialism; that it is grossly inaccurate in its statements on matters of fact and record, and that it includes a program of action likely to destroy the Socialist movement in this country, and to make the very word an offense to the American people.

What is it but a betrayal of the accepted principles of International Socialism to declare that the war now going on, the issue between the two groups of powers, is "no concern of the workers"? What is it but a denial of nationalism, without which there can be no internationalism, to say that the only struggle which would justify the workers taking up arms is the social war; that, therefore, all struggles for national independence are unjustifiable? What is it but a fundamental departure from the Socialism of Marx and Engels, of Liebknecht and Jaurès, to urge equally upon Belgian and German workers "to withdraw all support from their governments"? Is it not clear

APPENDIX

that the Belgian government in defending its territory and people against unwarranted invasion merited the support of all Belgian Socialists, upon Socialist grounds, while the German government, engaged in a dastardly violation of the sovereignty of a peaceful and friendly neighbor, merited the opposition of the German Socialists to the end of their power? To contend otherwise is to set Socialism against the moral sense of mankind. Even Von Bethmann-Hollweg, admitting the grave wrong done to Belgium, manifested in that moment of unwonted candor a keener appreciation of the essentials of internationalism and Socialism than did our National Emergency Convention.

The resolution adopted by the convention and which appears likely to receive the indorsement of the membership, declares that "In all modern history there has been no war more unjustified than the war in which we are about to engage." One thinks of the Franco-Prussian war, the Boer war, and the miserable land-grabbing Italian-Turkish war over Tripoli, to name only a few modern wars, and concludes that this declaration is the product of hysterical rather than historical minds.

From the opening of the great war I have

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

believed and freely said that the best interests of civilization and of international Socialism will be served by a definite defeat of the Central Empires. I have believed and said that the victory of German militarism would be a supreme disaster to civilization, a serious check to the international Socialist movement, and a terrible menace to the United States and its democratic institutions. Putting aside all the intricate maze of diplomatic contentions, the struggle from the first has appeared to me to be, in actuality, a conflict between militarist autocracy and democracy. I am well aware that the countries fighting against Germany have their military systems, and that none of them, not even the United States, is a perfect democracy. But I also know that Germany embodies the spirit of militarism in a special and unique way, and that the Entente countries embody the spirit of democracy in a greater degree than Germany or any of her allies. Naturally, when I have given expression to these views I have been called pro-Ally, and the fact that I was born in England and educated there has been offered in explanation. I have been accused of letting my nationalist feelings dominate my internationalism. On the other

APPENDIX

hand, those who have taken the opposite position, and have either excused or defended German acts, or advocated as American policies, in the name of neutrality, the measures which would fit into the plans of Germany and have actually been contended for by the diplomats of the Central Empires, have loudly proclaimed their freedom from nationalist bias, despite their foreign birth and lineage.

Now, as a matter of personal history, I was born in England, and it would be foolish to claim that my British lineage, birth, education, and associations have never influenced my views on this war. Any man making such a claim would have to ignore the vastly important psychological processes of the subconscious mind. All that I can say is that from the first I have tried to view the war as an internationalist, not as a nationalist. Never once have I asked myself, "How will England's cause be best served?" Always I have asked myself, "How will the international Socialist movement be best served?" That, I take it, is the true internationalist attitude.

Internationalism is not *antinationalism*. Internationalism presupposes nationalism. It is the interrelation of nations. The

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

maintenance of national integrity and independence is an essential condition of internationalism. This principle has not been seriously called into action in our movement hitherto. It has been the guiding principle of our policies. That is why we have always stood by the small nationalities in their struggles for independence. We have supported the people of Ireland, of Finland, of Poland, of Bohemia, and of India in their struggles for national independence. Now we are asked to abandon historic Socialism and accept the doctrine that national independence and integrity are worthless, if not positively wrong, and that the workers do wrong to defend them. Of course, this propaganda admirably serves the purposes of aggressive military powers.

When I came to this country of my own volition, because it appeared to me to offer greater opportunities for my work than did the land of my birth, the rights and advantages I then acquired carried with them certain obligations to this nation, and when later I took the oath of citizenship I did so without any reservation whatsoever. I repudiate the claim that loyalty to this nation is inconsistent with true internationalism. Loyal support to this nation in the present war

APPENDIX

is coincident with loyalty to the fundamental institutions without which there can be no Socialist organization of the world. The issue is not loyalty to a ruler or to a government, but to the fundamental institutions of American democracy, which, however imperfect, is the most advanced yet developed anywhere in the world.

Withdrawal from the Socialist Party is not an easy matter for me. For more than a quarter of a century, ever since my boyhood, I have been in the ranks of the organized Socialist movement. In it are centered nearly all of my friendships, and severance from it virtually means the beginning of life all over again. If I could have retained my intellectual integrity and self-respect and avoided the sacrifice which I needs must make, I would have done so. With the greatest possible reluctance I have been forced to the conclusion that I cannot honestly remain in the party.

I hope still to find opportunities to work for Socialism. Through the Intercollegiate Socialist Society and such other channels as are open to me, and free from Socialist Party control, I shall continue to expound Socialist principles as I have done for many years past. I shall work for the advance-

AMERICANISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

ment of actual Socialist measures in whatever ways I find open. And if, as I hope, among the thousands of comrades who have left the party in the past five or six years there shall develop a new organization, free from the narrow dogmatism and still narrower tactics which have crippled the Socialist Party, I shall join it and do my share to make it successful.

William Morris wrote, thirty-three years ago: "I cannot yet forego the hope of our forming a Socialist *party* which shall begin to act in our time, instead of a mere theoretical association." I believe the time has come for such a party. Conditions are ripe for a reorientation of the social democratic forces of the country upon a sound program of democratic public ownership, which will appeal to all who are desirous of aiding to establish industrial democracy. Any movement to that end will have my full support and co-operation.

With kind regards and good wishes,

Very sincerely yours,

JOHN SPARGO.

THE END



